DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 501 SP 022 263

AUTHOR Rounds, Thomas S.; And Others
TITLE Organization of Instruction. Elementary School--Junior High School Comparison. Junior High School Transition Study, Volume II. Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO EPSSP-82-3
PUB DATE 82
CONTRACT 400-80-01-03
NOTE 173p.; For related documents, see SP 022 256, SP 022 258, and SP 022 260-267. Some numbered volumes in this series were never released.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classes (Groups of Students); *Class Organization; Classroom Communication; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Observation Techniques; *Classroom Techniques; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Grade 6; Grade 7; Junior High Schools, Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; School Effectiveness; *Student Adjustment; *Student Behavior; Student Characteristics; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This volume, part of the Junior High School Transition Study which examined students' adjustment to junior high school, reports on findings related to instructional organization in elementary and junior high schools. Chapter 1 presents a brief overview of the project and outlines the theoretical framework used to describe and compare the ways in which instruction was organized in the sixth and seventh grade classrooms that were observed. It also includes a brief description of the way in which the organizational data were collected. Chapter 2 summarizes the findings regarding organization of instruction in 13 sixth grade classrooms that fed into Waverly Junior High School and 14 seventh grade classrooms at Waverly. Chapter 3 describes the particular organization of each of the sixth grade classrooms involved in the study; chapter 4 does the same for the seventh grade classrooms. Chapter 5 presents a brief description of the transition study teacher samples and the methodology used to collect data. This volume includes 39 tables and a bibliography. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230501

Ecological Perspectives for SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jeremy A. George

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume II - Organization of Instruction

Elementary School - Junior High School Comparison

Thomas S. Rounds
Beatrice A. Ward
John R. Mergendoller
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-82-3

SP 022 263

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

vol 2

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the National Institute of Education, Department of Education, under NIE Contract 400-80-01-03 to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Institute and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The major purpose of the Junior High School Transition Study is to provide information about students' transition from elementary school to entry into a middle or junior high school and to make recommendations regarding teaching practices that help students move successfully from one level of schooling to another. It focuses on five areas of inquiry. They are:

1) Does the organization of instruction change from elementary to junior high school? if so, how? What are the implications for students?

2) What are students' concerns and feelings about their elementary school experience? junior high school experience? What are the implications for design of the transition process? for teaching practices?

3) How do students participate in, and respond to, junior high school instruction? Do students respond differently in different circumstances? Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school?

4) How do students describe and define various aspects of the junior high school experience? What are the implications, if any, for improvement of the schooling process in the junior high school?

5) What are parents' concerns about students' transitions to, and experiences in, junior high school?

This volume reports the findings related to organization of instruction in elementary and junior high school.

The theoretical framework used to describe and compare the ways in which instruction was organized in the sixth-grade and seventh-grade classrooms that were observed was the activity structure. An activity structure includes six dimensions of classroom instruction: (1) the content of instruction, (2) group size and composition, (3) division of labor, (4) student control, (5) evaluation, and (6) student advancement.

If the structure of the classroom work activities in which students engage indeed teaches them as much as is taught by the content of the activities, information regarding the types of structures students experience in elementary school should prove helpful in planning for and carrying out successful junior high school or middle school transitions. Issues such as the types of responsibilities students

are required to assume within the elementary school structures and the number of different structures in which they are required to function on any given school day are of particular interest, since junior high school or middle school programs may be expected to require students to work with several teachers across a school day, each of whom may utilize a different activity structure. Likewise, the structures of the junior high/middle school classes are of interest because their actual complexity may increase or decrease the difficulty of the transition process.

Data collection related to the activity structures occurred in two phases. First, students and their teachers were observed in the sixth-grade classes that fed into Waverley Junior High School. These observations were conducted in May of the sixth-grade year. Descriptive narratives were developed reporting teacher-student interactions and other instructional events. In addition, curriculum interviews were conducted with the sixth-grade teachers. In these interviews, the teachers described the content they covered during the sixth grade, how they organized instruction in each content area for which they were responsible, why they used this organization, and how they evaluated students' performance in each case.

Second, observations were conducted in the seventh-grade classrooms during the first five weeks of the school year and again during the second week of November (the end of the first quarter of the school year). For each observation, descriptive narratives were produced describing four target students' participation in the instructional activities carried out in the classroom being observed (a separate narrative was produced for each target student). In addition, target-student interviews were conducted in mid-October and in November. In November, the seventh-grade teachers also audio-taped descriptions of their curriculum that provided information of the sort obtained in the sixth-grade teachers' curriculum interviews.

Two school-level patterns of organization were found in the four elementary schools in which sixth-grade data were collected. Two schools utilized a "cluster" approach for assignment of students and for instruction. In these settings, students rotated among the teachers for instruction in various subjects. The other two schools assigned the sixth-grade students to self-contained classrooms. In addition, one sixth-grade classroom in one "cluster" school was self-contained.

In general, the sixth-grade activity structures may be described as complex and diverse. Across any given day in the sixth-grade classrooms, regardless of whether assigned to a cluster or self-contained arrangement, a sixth-grade student was required to understand and function successfully (a) in several different grouping arrangements; (b) with a variety of responsibilities for control of work completion; and, in some instances, (c) in collaborative group project endeavors. Interestingly, the greater diversity occurred in the self-contained classrooms. While the sixth-grade cluster arrangements provided students an opportunity to become accustomed to interacting with several different teachers during the school day, most of the self-contained classrooms

provided greater challenges in terms of structural diversity. Hence the success of students' transition to junior high school can be viewed from at least two elementary school dimensions. These are multiple teachers and multiple structures. Within the structural dimension, the variations in student control options constitute a particularly important aspect of the elementary experience.

Data that were obtained regarding the seventh-grade activity structures indicate that the architectural arangement of Waverley Junior High School presented several mobility and student interaction problems to the entering seventh-graders. However, the structures used to organize instruction in the seventh-grade classrooms were neither varied nor complex. For example, a student might go for several days experiencing only whole-group instruction. There was little division of labor observed in any class. For the most part, student control was restricted to control over pacing, a necessary result of assignments that lasted longer than one day. Student control over the content of an assigned activity was evident only in two classes, and, in these classes, the items over which students had control -- the number of vocabulary words and whether or not to do extra credit -- seemed trivial. Only Teachers AJ and AH granted the students any substantial control over their academic experience. They allowed them to choose the amount of work they would do, which, in turn, was linked to the grade they would earn for a particular unit or assignment. Student advancement to new content always was dependent on the teacher deciding that the whole or small group was ready to move on and at which time a new content area would be introduced.

Further, the content of instruction, for the most part, emphasized fact-recall and fill-in-the-blank exercises. Only the high ability reading groups in the English classes were required to complete more complex learning tasks. In those classes where the teachers established varying performance criteria in order for students to earn higher grades for the fall quarter, the higher requirements generally required the students to do more of the same type of activities rather than different, more complex ones. The content taught in mathematics was of particular concern. At least through November of the seventh-grade year the curriculum repeated computation skills and mathematical concepts that had been taught in fifth and sixth grade. As a result, a majority of the students' in the math classes completed assignments quickly with little attention to what was to be done. They reported that math was "too easy" and "boring" and questioned the need to repeat things they already knew. One other area of concern was the omission of science as a subject that was offered to seventh-grade students.

On the whole, it appears that a student from one of the elementary schools in the Waverley attendance area most likely had to respond to, and function appropriately in, more complex structures in his or her sixth-grade classes than in his or her seventh-grade classes.

However, although the seventh-grade findings underlined the similarity of the structures in the classes observed at the junior high school level, teacher behavior within the structures seemed to create

different learning environments and different learning experiences for the students. Based on the data reported in the in-depth descriptions of the seventh-grade teachers' activity structures, four within-activity-structure features seem to contribute to these differences. These are:

- The extent to which the teacher was accessible to the students to help them with assigned tasks and provide feedback and reinforcement.
- The clarity of the teacher's directions and explanations.
- The extent to which the teacher stressed only content coverage or also attended to students' interest in the assigned tasks.
- The degree to which the teacher established and maintained classroom rules and norms and focused disciplinary actions on the individual(s) who did not conform to these expectations, rather than using large-group sanctions.

As part of the data analysis and reporting relative to students' transition experiences, a judgment was made as to the success of each target-student's transition in each seventh-grade classroom in which he or she was observed. Four criteria were applied by two independent raters to derive a successful/unsuccessful transition rating. The first criterion was the grade conferred on a student by the teacher at the time of the first-quarter report card (end of first nine weeks of the school year), with a "C-" or better as the minimum grade required for a moderately successful rating. The second criterion was the student's academic behavior in the classroom, including amount of time engaged in academic vs. nonacademic work, correctness of oral responses to teacher questions during recitations, or lack of such responses, and completion of assigned work. The third criterion included a general assessment of the appropriateness of the student's classroom behavior, given the rules and norms operable in the classroom. The fourth criterion looked at the student's social relationships with his or her peers, at a minimum requiring the relationships to be nonhostile. Using these criteria, each rater assigned each of the 24 target students an over-all successful, moderately successful, or unsuccessful transition rating for each classroom in which the student was observed. The ratings then were compared. In those few instances where the raters disagreed, a third party was asked to read the student's case description and make a rating. The majority rating prevailed.

Students' general transition ratings were related to two features of the sixth-grade. These were (1) whether the students worked with several teachers or were in self-contained classrooms in sixth grade and (2) the diversity in activity structures that the students experienced across a given school day.

Relative to working with multiple teachers, the students from the self-contained classes appear to have been more successful in

their transitions to Waverley Junior High School than those from the diversified classes. All the students who were from self-contained sixth-grade classes made successful or moderately successful transitions, while approximately 25 percent of the students from the sixth-grade settings where students moved from teacher to teacher failed to make successful transitions by the end of the first quarter of the school year.

In terms of the extent to which students were required to adapt to, and perform successfully in, different types of activity structures across the subject areas in the sixth grade, target students from the sixth-grade classes with structural diversity across subjects were more successful in their transition to junior high school than those from other classes. These included some self-contained classes as well as some combinations of "cluster" classes. Apparently students who learned to adapt to different structures (rather than different teacher personalities) in sixth-grade were better prepared to perform successfully in the departmentalized, six-period, seventh-grade program. This suggests that development of students' skills in decoding, understanding, and responding to the demands placed upon them by different configurations of activity structure elements may be a more important elementary school experience than merely moving from one teacher to another. When similar activity structures were used by either one or a cluster of teachers for work in a large portion of the sixth-grade subjects, the data suggest that the students in their classes had problems with the transition. Even though the seventh-grade teachers employed similar activity structures, previous experience with diverse structures in elementary school seemed to enhance students' capacity to move into the junior high school program successfully.

At the seventh-grade level, the teachers who had more than half the target students enrolled in their classes make successsful transitions were those who were accessible to students and established a system of rules and norms that maintained a classroom environment in which the teacher and students could function productively. Clarity of teacher instruction and attention to students' interests seemed to be less important. However, attention to students' interests was found to be helpful in terms of maintaining students' attention to assigned tasks.

Thus the portion of the Junior High School Transition Study that focused on organization of instruction (Volume II) identified features of the sixth-grade experience that appear to facilitate successful transition to junior high school. It also pointed out four instructional features that differentiated among junior high school teachers. Two of these -- accessibility and classroom management and discipline -- seem to be particularly important in terms of the success of students' performance in junior high school.

Ecological Perspectives for SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLING PRACTICE

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume II - Organization of Instruction

Elementary School - Junior High School Comparison

Thomas S. Rounds
Beatrice A. Ward
John R. Mergendoller
William J. Tikunoff

Report EPSSP-82-3

William J. Tikunoff
Director, Programs on Schooling

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA 94103

PREFACE

This volume is one in a series of reports of a multifaceted study that examined and described students' transition from elementary school (sixth grade) to a secondary school setting (seventh grade). It reports work conducted by the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Program at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The volumes in the series include:

Volume I: Overview of the Junior High School Transition Study

Volume II: Organization of Instruction: Elementary School-Junior High School Comparison

Volume III: Student Perceptions of Transition and School

Volume IV: Student Experience During and Response to Transition to Junior High School

Volume V: Student Definitions of Teachers

Volume VI: Parent Concerns Regarding Transition to Junior High School

Volume VII: A Study of the Transition to Junior High School: Summary of the Findings and Implications for Provision of Successful Transition Experiences for All Students

The Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Program is one of a series of long-term, innovative efforts to improve educational opportunities for all children and youth, funded by the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Education. Beatrice A. Ward and William J. Tikunoff are the co-principal investigators of the transition study. Other professional staff members include John R. Mergendoller, project director; Alexis L. Mitman, associate research scientist; and Thomas S. Rounds, associate research scientist.

We wish to thank Virginia Koehler and Michael Cohen, Teaching and Learning Division, National Institute of Education, for their support of the Ecological Perspectives Program and, more specifically, the Junior High School Transition Study reported here. Their willingness to explore innovative ways of approaching the problems that confront educators and their encouragement of educational excellence are appreciated.

We also wish to thank the principals, teachers, students, and parents who collaborated with us in the conduct of this transition study. Their willingness to inquire into and analyze the multiple features of their instructional programs and the students' experiences in these programs made it possible to carry out the in-depth inquiry reported in the volumes listed above. Together, we learned much about successful transition experiences for students.

The school district assistant superintendent also merits special recognition. He not only contributed data collected by the school district to the study data base, he also participated in discussion and interpretation of many of the findings.

Many individuals helped in the preparation of this particular volume. Donald Swarthout, now of the Charlotte, North Carolina School District, directed the sixth-grade phase of the study. John R. Mergendoller directed the seventh-grade phase. Thomas S. Rounds, Christine Baker, Martin Packer, Nora Luke, Evelyn Ickes, Sahedran Satizan, and Phair Brand collected data in the seventh-grade classes. Beatrice A. Ward supervised the data analysis, which was conducted by Mr. Rounds. Mr. Rounds and Dr. Ward took primary responsibility for conceptualizing and writing the volume. Barbara Murray supervised and directed the effort of the support staff who prepared this manuscript. They included Charlie Ray Altizer, who was responsible for inserting the authors' edits and assuring correctness of grammar and consistency of format in the report, and Marcia Petty and Paul Halley, who provided word processing support. To all, thank you.

Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff
John R. Mergendoller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Preface ix

Chapter One: INTRODUCTION 1

Theoretical Framework Used to Describe Organization of Instruction 3

Activity Structure Data Collection 10

Chapter Two: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS REGARDING ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADE SIX) AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (GRADE SEVEN) 13

Seventh-Grade Activity Structures 23

Comparison of Sixth- and Seventh-Grade Activity Structures 35

Inside the Seventh-Grade Activity Structures 42

Relationship of Organization of Instruction and Students' Successful Transition to Junior High School 51

Conclusion and Relation to the Literature on Early Adolescent Schooling 57

Chapter Three: ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN SIXTH-GRADE CLASSROOMS 63

CH Dana Elementary School 3

Bluff Street Elementary School 71

Hawthorne Elementary School 75

JM Keynes Elementary School 80

Conclusion 84

Chapter Four: ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN SEVENTH-GRADE CLASSROOMS 87

English 87

Math 106

History 120

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Reading 131

Block 138

Conclusion 146

Chapter Five: SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY 147

Sample 147

Data Collection and Analysis 152

Summary 157

References 159

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Content and Grouping Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Cluster Classrooms	13
2.2	Student Control Element of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Cluster Classrooms	18
2.3	Content and Grouping Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Self-Contained Classrooms	20
2.4	Student Control Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Self-Contained Classrooms	22
2.5	Content and Grouping Elements of Structures in Seventh-Grade Classrooms	26
2.6	Student Control Element of Activity Structures in Seventh-Grade Classrooms	31
2.7	Success of Target-Student Transition to Seventh Grade Based on Sixth-Grade Self-Contained or Diversified Classroom Setting	53
2.8	Success of Target Student Transition to Seventh Grade Based on Structural Diversity in Organization for Instruction Across Sixth-Grade Classrooms	54
2.9	Percent of Target Students Who Were Rated Successful, Moderately Successful, or Unsuccessful in Specific Seventh-Grade Teachers' Classes	56
3.1	Teacher 301's Activity Structures	65
3.2	Teacher 302's Activity Structures	68
3.3	Teacher 303's Activity Structures	68
3.4	Teacher 304's Activity Structures	69
3.5	Teacher 305's Activity Structures	70
3.6	Teacher 401's Activity Structures	72
3.7	Teacher 402's Activity Structures	74
3.8	Teacher 601's Activity Structures	76
3.9	Teacher 602's Activity Structures	78

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
3.10	Teacher 603's Activity Structures	79
3.11	Teacher 701's Activity Structures	82
3.12	Teacher 702's Activity Structures	83
3.13	Teacher 703's Activity Structures	84
4.1	Teacher AA's Activity Structures	88
4.2	Teacher AB's Activity Structures	97
4.3	Teacher AC's Activity Structures	104
4.4	Teacher AD's Activity Structures	106
4.5	Teacher AE's Math Activity Structure	114
4.6	Teacher AJ's Math Activity Structure	118
4.7.	Teacher AB's World History Activity Structure	120
4.8	Teacher AG's World History Activity Structure	123
4.9	Teacher AJ's World History Activity Structure	127
4.10	Teacher AH's Reading Skills Activity Structure	132
4.11	Teacher AI's Reading Skills Activity Structure	137
4.12	Teacher AF's Art Activity Structure	139
4.13	Teacher AG's Music Activity Structure	143
4.14	Teacher AK's Home Economics Activity Structure	145
5.1	Sixth-Grade Teacher Sample and Data Collection in Which They Participated in Transition Study	149
5.2	Seventh-Grade Teachers, the Teaching Credential Each Holds, and the Subjects in Which Each Was Observed	150
5.3	Seventh-Grade Teacher Sample Participation in Data Collection	154

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The transition from elementary to secondary school -- middle or junior high school -- is a stage in the life of American youth that is currently receiving much attention from parents, educators, and researchers. According to Lipsitz (1980), one reason for the concern is the mounting evidence that early adolescence is a troubled time for at least 20 percent of the students enrolled in middle or junior high school. To illustrate the problems that may occur, Lipsitz notes that school violence "reaches its heights during the junior high school years" and "the most dangerous place for a seventh-grader to be is in school" (p. 8). Lipsitz also states that juvenile crime seems to reach a peak around age 14 and that 14 1/2 is the average age of runaways. Other statistics cited by Lipsitz include the fact that "the only age group for which the birth rate is not decreasing is that of fifteen-year olds and under" (p. 8). In addition, she notes that the rate of hard and soft drug abuse "soars" during junior high school, that "somewhere between 20 percent and 30 percent of eighth-graders drink excessively," and that "the suicide rate among young adolescents, while lower than for youth aged sixteen to twenty-two, is rapidly rising, and may have doubled in the past twenty years" (p. 8). Thus it appears that the middle and junior high school years present problems for some youngsters and may be times of crisis for approximately one or two out of every ten students at this age level.

Among the problems that may face youngsters in the transition from elementary school to secondary school is the shift from the self-contained classroom -- or from participation in a limited number of classrooms -- to the multiple-classroom environment of the middle and junior high school. In the multiple-classroom setting, students must interpret and adapt to a school environment that is both instructionally and socially complex. They must deal with six or seven teachers, each of whom may place different demands on them. They must adapt to a new peer culture composed of students from a number of different elementary schools. They must shift from being the oldest students in their schooling world to being the youngest in a new educational environment.

These challenges of adaptation are accompanied by a variety of developmental changes that face early adolescents. As noted by Blyth, Simmons, and Bush (1978), transition from childhood into early adolescence can be defined in terms of both physical maturity and social criteria (p. 149). While physical maturation may be expected to vary considerably among a group of students ages 12-13 (for example, see discussion by Tanner, 1961), Elder (1968, p.4) notes, among others,

that movement into a secondary school (e.g., junior high school) also may mark the social beginning of adolescence. Hence middle and junior high students must not only deal with the physiological changes brought on by the onset of puberty, but also the social pressures accompanying the establishment of new types of relationships with members of the opposite sex. For example, as noted earlier, students may be exposed to a peer culture that promotes opportunities to experiment with drugs and alcohol. Further, as they strive to attain independence, they may challenge, and be rebuffed by, the requirements of adult-formulated rules and procedures, both in school and at home.

For all these reasons, early adolescence may be a stressful period for students, and entry into junior high or middle school may be a difficult transition. However, if the student role that is learned in the elementary school (for example, see Dreeben, 1968; and Jackson, 1968) also prevails in the middle or junior high school, the move to the new setting may not be as difficult as one might initially expect. Students may be able to employ many of the academic and social behaviors, expectations, etc., that worked successfully for them in elementary school in the new setting as well.

Since little is known about students' responses to entry into junior high school or middle school, determining whether the move from an elementary setting is traumatic, easy, etc., for students requires additional information. The major purpose of the Junior High School Transition Study is to provide information about this transition process and to make recommendations regarding teaching practices that help students move successfully from elementary to secondary school. The study was conducted in a single junior high school and the elementary schools from which the students came. It focuses on five areas of inquiry. They are:

1) Does the organization of instruction change from elementary to junior high school? if so, how? What are the implications for students?

2) What are students' concerns and feelings about their elementary school experience? junior high school experience? What are the implications for design of the transition process? for teaching practices?

3) How do students participate in, and respond to, junior high school instruction? Do students respond differently in different circumstances? Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school?

4) How do students describe and define various aspects of the junior high school experience? What are the implications, if any, for improvement of the schooling process in the junior high school?

5) What are parents' concerns about students' transitions to, and experiences in, junior high school?

This volume reports the findings related to organization of instruction in elementary and junior high school. In addition to the brief overview presented above, this chapter outlines the theoretical framework used to describe and compare the ways in which instruction was organized in the sixth-grade and seventh-grade classrooms that were observed. It also includes a brief description of the way in which the organizational data were collected. Chapter Two synthesizes the observations and findings related to organization of instruction in 13 sixth-grade classrooms that fed into Waverley Junior High School -- the school that was the focus of the study -- and 11 seventh-grade classrooms. The remaining chapters provide a greater level of detail about each of the sixth-grade classrooms (Chapter Three) and each of the seventh-grade classrooms (Chapter Four). Chapter Five describes the teacher and student sample and the methodology employed in gathering the information reported herein.

Theoretical Framework Used to Describe Organization of Instruction

The 30 or so students, the teacher, and possibly other adults who comprise the teaching-learning group in a classroom may represent diverse backgrounds and unique experiences, capabilities, interests, goals, etc. As noted by Barr and Dreeben (1977), this characteristic of classrooms makes instruction much more complex than simply applying dyadic learning psychology principles. Attention to the social, as well as the psychological, behavior of individuals is required. As a result, the ways in which classrooms are structured, to achieve some semblance of order among individuals and to facilitate accomplishment of classroom work activity, influence achievement, friendship patterns, etc. Bossert (1978) supports this view when he states:

> . . . what students are exposed to should affect what they learn. Yet the structure and methods used to transmit the content of the curriculum and to facilitate the development of required skills also are important determinants of learning. (p. 13)

Given that transition from childhood to adolescence is a social, as well as a physical and psychological, process (see earlier discussion), concern for the social features of the classroom appears to be particularly important at the junior high level. Studying instructional organization in a junior high school thus requires attention to the fact that schools are complex social organizations, that "the organizational characteristics of schools have implications for what occurs in classrooms" (Schlechty, 1976, p. 43), and that classrooms themselves can be perceived as complex social organizations. As a result, as students advance through school they learn far more than merely the prescribed curriculum.

For instance, Dreeben (1967) pointed out that schooling is, in itself, a process of socialization, providing a linkage between what a child learns at home and what he or she will need to learn for a successful adulthood. Socialization is accomplished by establishing

and reinforcing social norms, or principles of conduct, and "schooling contributes to pupils' learning what the norms are, accepting them, and acting according to them" (Dreeben, 1967, p. 27).

To illustrate the differences between home and school norms, consider that a typical junior high school youngster may learn to call on others for help at home, while school tasks typically require that one must learn to work independently, be self-reliant, accept responsibility for one's own behavior and the consequences thereof, and differentiate between when it is all right to work with and help others and when it is wrong to do so. Success in completing school tasks often means competing against some standard of excellence and often puts the youngster in competition with others, while at home he or she may be motivated to achieve primarily through nurturance.

Further, universalism and specificity -- wherein a youngster learns to accept being categorized by others as well as learning to "confine one's interests to a narrow range of characteristics and concerns, or to extend them to include a broad range" (Dreeben, 1967, p. 41) -- often are in conflict with home learning, which emphasizes the individuality of identity. In fact, teachers and parents alike perceive this latter norm to be dehumanizing, although they operationally exhibit its use in their own sanctioning behavior with youngsters.

Reflecting on both Dewey's and McLuhan's statements, Postman and Weingartner (1969) stated that:

> a classroom is a learning environment and . . . the way it is organized carries the burden of what people will learn from it . . . the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs. (pp. 18-19)

This position seems to agree with that taken by Dreeben (1967, 1968) and Bidwell (1972).

Within such a frame of reference, the notion of activity structures provides a useful tool for the study of instructional organization. According to Bossert (1978, pp. 11-12) activity structures include the following elements:

1) the modes of behavior which constitute the activity itself, e.g., what the teacher does, what students are expected to do, the number of different tasks;

2) the reward structure embodied in the activity, e.g., how a student learns success or failure, how critiquing of students' performance is communicated by the teacher (publicly or privately);

3) the sequencing of rewards or punishments in relation to behavior, i.e., the system of evaluation used by the teacher and how public it is;

4) the collective character of the activity, e.g., number of people involved, internal division of labor, choice of behavioral options;

5) the nature of social relations in an activity, e.g., the amount of talking allowed, the amount of mobility allowed, the general level of opportunity for social interaction.

While Bossert's five criteria provide a framework for analyzing instructional activities in any given classroom, for purposes of the Junior High School Transition Study, the criteria were adapted and expanded to incorporate six dimensions of classroom instruction, or six activity structure elements. These are: (1) the content of instruction, (2) group size and composition, (3) division of labor, (4) student control, (5) evaluation, and (6) student advancement. A brief description of each element follows.

Content

Within a classroom setting, work content can be considered at several levels. At a global level, content includes the designations given various time blocks during the school day, such as math, social studies, physical education, reading, and study hall or job periods. These terms, in turn, convey general expectations regarding the topics and skills around which students' work will be organized during a particular time period, including some common types of responses they will be expected to make. In addition to this global content label, the specific knowledge and skills (e.g., cognitive or information-processing skills, how-to-do-it skills, motor skills) to be applied and acquired during a particular work block and how these relate to the content of work activities across the school year add to the definition of work content. Further, because the work assigned to the 30 or so students in a classroom may not be the same for all students, it may be necessary to investigate the work content for individual students, as well as for the class as a whole.

At the junior high school level, the content of instruction may be expected to be broader than in elementary school. New areas such as foreign language, shop, and home economics may be included in the curricular content offered. Other subjects taught at the elementary level may increase in conceptual complexity and expand to new knowledge and skill areas. Hence comparison of elementary and junior high school instruction along the content dimension is warranted.

Group Size and Composition

Prior discussion has emphasized that schools typically are comprised of classrooms containing students who have been assigned to teachers for the purpose of carrying out classroom instruction. Depending on the manner in which students are assigned, they may: (1) remain with the same teacher for an extended period of time, as, for example, in the self-contained elementary school classroom, where 30 or so students are assigned to a single teacher for the entire day and the entire school year; or (2) work in several different student groups during a school day and across a school year, e.g., the typical junior or senior high school practice of assigning students to different teachers for work in various subject areas.

Hence criteria for assigning students to classes and to groups within classes are an important issue, since the multiplicity and flexibility with which students are assigned to groups can limit or increase the types of instruction in which a student may be required to participate. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate what occurs at each work group level. Instructional organization data based on this activity structure element need to be collected at a school level, a total-class level (if that is the size of the work group) and for smaller configurations of students when they are divided into subgroups to carry out assigned work in a class. For example, several of the elementary schools in the transition study reported here had "cluster" arrangements for the sixth grade. In these clusters, students typically moved from classroom to classroom and from teacher to teacher during the day based on some kind of grouping decision. In the junior high school, the pattern consisted of students changing classrooms and teachers at the end of each period. Membership in the instructional group -- which students were together in which room -- typically changed as well. These fundamental grouping decisions were made outside the classroom. At the same time, within some classrooms at both the elementary and junior high school level, further subgroupings of students were formed, using a variety of criteria. Hence this element offers a multilevel perspective of instructional organization. Decisions made at each level influence the learning experiences students will have.

Division of Labor

Underlying this element of an activity structure is the premise that the manner in which classroom work activity is structured will, to a large degree, determine whether students are to work independently or with others (i.e., work cooperatively). Both types of behavior, of course, are desirable, given the differing objectives of various work activities. However, if one is to participate successfully as an adult in society, one should be able to understand the conditions under which either independence or collaboration is expected and know how to participate accordingly. In other words, one must learn when and how to work independently as well as when and how to work cooperatively with fellow workers.

Further, a high level of independence leads to group relations that differ from the social relationships observed when workers have to collaborate. For example, Sayles (1958) found that:

> the internal structuring of work operations . . . affects significantly the behavior characteristics of a group. That is, the relations between members prescribed by the flow of work processes are a critical variable shaping the internal social systems of a group. (p. 42)

According to Bossert (1979), "These variables account for differences in group cohesion, interdependence among members, and the propensity of group action" (p. 5).

In that both collaboration and independence are expected to occur in classroom work, it is important to inquire into and understand the structural properties that define the conditions under which either is required or allowed. It is hypothesized that (a) the amount and types of independence or collaboration required for a given work activity; and (b) in the case of collaboration, who works with whom, for what ends, and how, set the boundaries within which students must interact to complete an assigned work activity.

When the activity structure requires students to work together in a group to complete a task, it forces the students to collaborate; to divide the work among themselves. On the one hand, within this general structure, it is possible that the students may each have the same role in the group, e.g., in painting a mural or playing a game each student is a painter or a player; there is no role differentiation required by the structure. On the other hand, when group tasks focus on a single product or task to be produced or completed by the group as a whole, role differentiation may be required. A committee with a secretary or a group project with a researcher, a writer, and a map maker are examples of tasks with explicit role differentiation required by the structure. As students grow older and learn more complex ways of working together and sharing responsibility, one might expect opportunities for role-differentiated collaborative work to increase. The extent to which this occurs may be described and measured based on the division-of-labor element of the activity structure.

Student Control

In the classroom, students' work typically will be prescribed by the teacher, inasmuch as students are mandated to attend school up to a certain age, and teachers are the legally assigned authority figures in charge. In addition, a general expectation of schooling is that students come to school to learn and that learning is accomplished through participation in classroom work.

However, within some activity structures, students are required, or allowed, to control some aspects of their work. The amount and type of control delegated to students may affect the cognitive and interactional demands of the work activity and the learning outcomes

derived by the students as a result of engaging in that activity. As students grow toward adulthood and acquire the skills necessary to work independently, teachers might be expected to provide greater opportunities for students to control various aspects of classroom work assignments.

Based on the work of Bossert (1979) and Tikunoff, et al (1979), student control typically has been found to occur in six areas. These are:

- Order in which prescribed tasks will be completed. This may range from a situation in which the teacher or the product demands that a particular task order be followed, to one in which tasks may be completed in a variety of sequences and the student follows whatever sequence he/she wishes.

- Pacing or the amount of time to be devoted to a particular task. In some classroom settings pacing may be completely under the control of the teacher. In other situations, the amount of time devoted to a task may be negotiable with the major determinant being that the work is completed by a prescribed and understood period of time, perhaps an hour or two, a day, a week, and so on. The student determines the speed with which to do the work within the time frame.

- Procedures used to complete the assigned work. Again, variations may be from total prescription by the teacher to a student's election of the means to achieve a designated outcome.

- Products to be achieved. Choices in this category may range from none (teacher-prescribed content and form of product) to student selection of the content and form of the product. However, students rarely are free to select both the content and form of the outcomes of schoolwork.

- Participation in classroom activities. In some classes participation in an activity may be explicitly required of all students. In others a student may choose when and where to participate. Often such choices are contingent on the student obeying class norms. For example, in a typical class recitation session, a student has the opportunity to choose whether or not to volunteer an answer. At a more tacit level, the student may pretend to read during silent reading or sit silently while his group works on a social studies project.

- Materials to be used. Areas of choice in this category include such items as instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, encyclopedias, films, filmstrips), arts and crafts materials, and at times, resource persons.

Evaluation

Evaluation is an ever-present feature in classroom life. Jackson (1968) illustrates the importance of this:

> Every child experiences the pain of failure and the joy of success long before he reaches school age, but his achievements, or lack of them, do not really become official until he enters the classroom. From then on, a semi-public record of his progress gradually accumulates, and as a student he must learn to adapt to the continued and pervasive spirit of evaluation that will dominate his school years. (p. 19)

The types of evaluation that occur within particular activity structures and the ways in which these are administered, therefore, constitute an important element of the activity structure. Building on the work of Jackson (1968), Dahloff (1971), and Bossert (1979), four aspects of teacher evaluation are of interest:

- The publicness of the communication. Is evaluative information presented so that everyone in the class can hear, or is the information audible only to the student being evaluated?

- Who is being evaluated? While clearly teachers evaluate the performance of individual students, they also evaluate the performance of groups of students and of the whole class.

- What is being evaluated? Teachers evaluate at least three aspects of students' participation: their academic performance, their adherence to the rules and procedures of the classroom and school, and the students' character.

- Quality. Positive or negative aspects of the students' performances may be stressed. Statements that are made, grades that are given, etc., may be in a form that does or does not allow comparison of the quality of one student's work with that of other students.

These four components of evaluation may be combined in any number of ways. For example, the comment, "Very good job, Marcia," may be a private, positive evaluation of an individual's academic work. "I can't believe the way you guys acted up today," represents a public, negative evaluation of the class's behavior.

Student Advancement

Interrelated with the activity structure elements outlined above is the extent to which a student is free to move ahead with a task,

versus being dependent on others in order to (a) perform certain aspects of the work, (b) acquire and use certain materials, or (c) receive additional instruction. Content, group size, and the amount of independence or collaboration demanded by an instructional activity may restrict a student's advancement. The choices available to a student and the mode of evaluation being used also may be related to the opportunity for students' to move ahead independently and their willingness to do so.

The areas of interest that are related to the student advancement element are those observable factors or situations in the classroom that create student dependency on the teacher and/or others to complete work. For example, when a whole class is working on mathematics problems, a teacher may insist that all students complete a particular problem before anyone moves on to the next problem. Students may need to wait to use materials if there is a shortage of them and completion of a work activity demands their use. If the teacher serves as the sole source of information, students may be required to wait for assistance, either by standing in line or by sitting at their desks with hands raised. Hence restrictions on student advancement may influence how much, as well as what, is achieved.

Activity Structure Data Collection

The above, then, are the six activity structure elements that were used to describe organization of instruction in the sixth- and seventh-grade classes in the transition study reported here.

Data collection related to the activity structures occurred in two phases. First, students and their teachers were observed in the sixth-grade classes that fed into Waverley Junior High School. These observations were conducted in May of the sixth-grade year. Descriptive narratives were developed reporting teacher-student interactions and other instructional events. In addition, curriculum interviews were conducted with the sixth-grade teachers. In these interviews, the teachers described the content they covered during the sixth grade, how they organized instruction in each content area for which they were responsible, why they used this organization, and how they evaluated students' performances in each case.

Second, observations were conducted in the seventh-grade classrooms during the first five weeks of the school year and again during the second week of November (the end of the first quarter of the school year). For each observation, descriptive narratives were produced describing four target students' participation in the instructional activities carried out in the classroom being observed (a separate narrative was produced for each target student). In addition, target-student interviews were conducted in mid-October and in November. In November, the seventh-grade teachers also audio-taped descriptions of their curriculum that provided information of the sort obtained in the sixth-grade teachers' curriculum interviews.

The data about the sixth- and seventh-grade activity structure elements that are synthesized in Chapter Two and presented in greater detail in Chapters Three and Four of this volume were assembled from these data sources. Additional information regarding the data collection methodology is presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS REGARDING ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADE SIX) AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (GRADE SEVEN)

This chapter summarizes the findings regarding organization of instruction in 13 sixth-grade classrooms that fed into Waverley Junior High School and 14 seventh-grade classrooms at Waverley. It first summarizes the findings regarding organization of instruction in the grade six classes. This is followed by a similar synthesis for the grade seven classes. This later description includes a discussion of several school-level variables that appeared to influence what occurred in the seventh-grade classrooms, as well as the classroom data. Next, the sixth- and seventh-grade findings are compared, and an example is presented of the types of instructional demands to which students were required to respond on a typical day in the elementary versus the junior high school setting. The fourth section looks inside the organization of instruction in the seventh-grade classrooms to identify significant features of the teachers' approaches to instruction. Finally, conclusions are presented regarding the characteristics that differentiated among seventh-grade classrooms that facilitated students' successful transition to junior high school and those that did not. Recommendations also are made for improvement of students' junior high school schooling. Study findings are then related to other research on adolescent schooling.

Sixth-Grade Activity Structures

If the structure of the classroom work activities in which students engage indeed teaches them as much as is taught by the content of the activities, information regarding the types of structures students experience in elementary school should prove helpful in planning for and carrying out successful junior high school or middle school transitions. Issues such as the types of responsibilities students were required to assume within the elementary school structures and the number of different structures in which they were required to function on any given school day are of particular interest, since junior high school or middle school programs may be expected to require students to work with several teachers across a school day, each of whom may utilize a different activity structure.

As noted previously, activity structure data were collected in the sixth-grade classes from which students graduated to Waverley

Junior High School. A total of 15 classes in six elementary schools were in the Waverley attendance area. Thirteen classes in four of the elementary schools participated in the sixth-grade data collection. The other two classes were each located in a school where there was only one sixth grade. Thus these teachers felt data regarding their classes would be easily identified and therefore opted not to participate, because it would be impossible to maintain anonymity.

Two school-level patterns of organization were found in the four elementary schools in which sixth-grade data were collected. Two schools utilized a "cluster" approach for assignment of students and for instruction. In these settings, students rotated among the teachers for instruction in various subjects. The other two schools assigned the sixth-grade students to self-contained classrooms. In addition, one sixth-grade classroom in one "cluster" school was self-contained. The synthesis of the activity structure data for these classes is presented separately for the cluster and self-contained classrooms, in order to facilitate comparison of the diversity of structures in which students were placed and the types of responsibilities students were required to assume in the two settings. Chapter Three provides a more detailed description of the structures in each classroom.

Cluster Classrooms

CH Dana and JM Keynes Elementary Schools used the cluster approach. At CH Dana Elementary School, four teachers worked together in the cluster program. Each day, the students rotated among these teachers for work in various subject areas. At JM Keynes Elementary School, each teacher was responsible for a different subject. Early in the school year, the students had rotated among the three teachers for work in the various subjects. However, during the observations in May of the sixth-grade year, the cluster was organized so all 90 students from the three teachers' classrooms worked as a large group in the center of the open-space "pod." The teachers alternated instructing this large group of students.

Thus, at these two schools, the sixth-grade students were placed in instructional arrangements that were similar to a secondary school program. The students had different teachers during the day and they moved from classroom to classroom. The activity structures utilized in these different classes are discussed below, beginning with the content element.

Content. The grouping arrangements in which students worked varied in the two cluster programs. At CH Dana Elementary School, each class contained multi-age and multi-grade-level students. Fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students were assigned to each classroom. Based on the teacher to whom they were assigned for homeroom, students rotated as a group to Teacher 302 for language arts, Teacher 303 for health, science, social studies, art, and drama, Teacher 304 for reading skills development and silent reading, and Teacher 305 for math.

All the teachers taught physical education and managed an afternoon work period with their homeroom students. These arrangements, which are summarized in Table 2.1, required the students to change classrooms at least four or five times a day. However, it must be noted that the classrooms were arranged so students were not required to move to distant places in the school building.

In the JM Keynes cluster, Teacher 701 taught reading and language arts. Teacher 702 also taught reading, as well as health, science, and social studies. Teacher 703 taught math. All classes were comprised of sixth-grade students only. Since April, all 90 students had been taught at one time by the teacher responsible for a given subject area. While this teacher instructed, the other two monitored the students' work as they circulated among them, corrected papers, planned future lessons, and so forth. The order in which subjects were presented varied somewhat from day to day. That is, the first lesson of the day might be math on one day and reading the next. The students had to remember this schedule and take the appropriate books and materials with them to the central area. Their materials were stored in desks or cabinets in the open classroom areas that were located around the central space.

In terms of subject areas taught, no mention was made of music or foreign language in the teachers' curriculum interviews at either school, nor was instruction in these areas observed to occur. Further, at JM Keynes, no mention was made of physical education, art or drama, and they also were not observed. However, physical education is assumed to have occurred in some form during each week in both schools.

Grouping. As illustrated in Table 2.1, the students in the CH Dana cluster worked in a number of different grouping arrangements. For math and reading, they were placed in small groups of six or so students, based on ability. In health, science, and social studies, some small-group work also occurred. However, these groups were formed heterogeneously. Language arts, physical education, and art were whole-group activities. Silent reading was carried out by the whole group of students, but most often each student read a different book. Hence movement from teacher to teacher and subject to subject placed the CH Dana students in diverse grouping situations.

It is unfortunate that we have no information on the grouping used in the JM Keynes structure during the time when students rotated from teacher to teacher. In the three-class arrangement utilized during April, May, and June of the students' sixth-grade year, most instruction was whole group, which meant a 90-student group. Some small-group arrangements were used for math, reading, and language arts. However, because of the unusually large size of the whole group, these small groups often included 30 or more students, which, in most classrooms, would represent whole-group instruction. As a result, based on the last three months of the year, one must assume that the sixth-grade students at JM Keynes had little variation in the grouping arrangements in which they worked. This is important because it would be difficult for a dependent student who needed individual teacher assistance to perform successfully or a social student who preferred to interact with other students to do so without

Table 2.1

Content and Grouping Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Cluster Classrooms

SCHOOL	CH Dana Elementary School				JM Keynes Elementary School		
CLASSROOM	302	303	304	305	701	702	703
CONTENT AREA: Math				small group or individual based on ability*			small groups one 50, one 30, one 8 students, based on ability
CONTENT AREA: Reading			small groups of 6 students based on ability		whole group, 90 students	whole group; small remedial group, 10-12 students	
CONTENT AREA: Health and Science		small groups; heterogeneous				whole group, 90 students	
CONTENT AREA: Language Arts	whole group, 30 or so students				whole group, 90 students; small group, 8-50 students based on ability		
CONTENT AREA: Social Studies		some whole group; some small groups based on ability				whole group, 90 students	
Physical Education	whole group	whole group	whole group	whole group			
Art		whole group					
Drama		small groups; heterogeneous					
Silent Reading		whole group; individual reading					

* Describes grouping arrangement and, for small groups, basis of composition.

becoming a behavior problem in this arrangement. On the one hand, such students could become accustomed to spending much of their time in unproductive activities; on the other hand, students who could work well on their own might learn to prefer such a setting. In any case, the cluster afforded the students an opportunity to work with three different teachers during the day.

Division of labor. In these classrooms little division of labor occurred in which students assumed differentiated roles in order to produce a single product or outcome. Teacher 303's drama activities provided an exception to this general pattern. In the other subject areas, students in the CH Dana cluster sometimes worked in pairs to give one another spelling tests when they were with Teacher 302. Teacher 303 had teams of students work together on science and social studies projects. However, each student produced his or her own product. No cooperative products were required.

No division of labor occurred in the JM Keynes cluster. Students worked alone on the assignments (seatwork) they were given in all subject areas.

Student control. Table 2.2 summarizes the types of control students in the two cluster settings were given over their work. Students in the CH Dana cluster were able to make some decisions about various aspects of the work in most subjects. These students had frequent opportunities to assume responsibility for planning and carrying out at least one facet of their work.

In the JM Keynes cluster, the main area of control given to the students was pacing of their work on parts of week-long assignments. This procedure was used in math, reading and language arts.

Hence both groups of sixth-grade students were accustomed to being responsible for parts of their schoolwork. The CH Dana students were expected to make creative decisions regarding their work, as well as set a work pace that resulted in completion of assigned work by the designated date.

Evaluation. In the clusters, most of the public evaluation that occurred was in the form of behavior control. Typically, it was public and negative. In the JM Keynes cluster, students were required to write complicated words such as "rhododendron" or "chrysanthemum" several hundred times as a punishment for talking.

Academic performance usually was evaluated privately in the form of written comments on completed assignments or through person-to-person discussions. In addition, in the CH Dana cluster, Teacher 302 would compliment or scold the entire class on the general quality of the work the students had done. Students in Teacher 304's class received some feedback by self-checking their work.

Although specific comments on an individual student's work tended to be given privately, seating in the large group in the JM Keynes cluster was arranged so "D" and "F" students were required to sit at

Table 2.2

Student Control Element of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Cluster Classrooms

CONTENT AREA	SCHOOL	CH Dana Elementary School				JM Keynes Elementary School		
	CLASSROOM	302	303	304	305	701	702	703
	Math				pacing within packet for week			pacing in week's assignment; sequence of assignments during week
	Reading			reading kit; pacing in kit; form of book report		pacing in assignment for week	none	
	Health and Science		none				none	
	Language Arts	control over topic in creative writing				choice of assignment alternatives; pacing in week's assignment		
	Social Studies		order in which assignments completed				none	
	Physical Education	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED				NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
	Art		what to create			NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
	Drama		select procedure used to dramatize			NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
	Silent Reading			selection of book		NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		

the front of the group so they could be monitored more readily. This practice clearly identified the poor students to everyone.

Student advancement. It is interesting to note that, while the CH Dana and JM Keynes cluster teachers allowed students to control several facets of their work, they did not allow them to advance to new assignments or new skill and knowledge areas without teacher approval and direction. This practice often meant that some students who had control over the pacing of their work would complete the assignments early and have extra time to fill. It meant other students would have to rush to be ready to move on with the teacher. In the CH Dana cluster, where many small groups were used, this problem did not occur as frequently as it did in the cluster with the very large student group.

Self-Contained Classrooms

The sixth-grade classes at the Bluff Street Elementary School and Hawthorne Elementary School all were self-contained. One classroom at the CH Dana School also was self-contained. The activity structures observed in these classes are described below.

Content. Teachers in the self-contained classrooms were responsible for instruction in all the subject areas. The listing in Table 2.3 includes all the subjects that were taught during the May observations in the different classrooms and/or were discussed in the teachers' curriculum interviews. In Bluff Street Elementary School and Hawthorne Elementary School, low-achieving students in reading spent some time each week with a remedial reading teacher. These were the only students who worked with a teacher other than the one assigned to their regular class.

Grouping. Although the students in these classes remained with the same teacher all day, the grouping practices to which they had to adapt to be successful students varied as much as in the cluster arrangements. For example, in Teacher 301's class students worked in small groups based on ability for reading and heterogeneous small groups for art and physical education. Math and language arts were individualized. Health, science, and social studies were taught to the whole group. Only Teacher 602 used whole-group instruction for all subjects. All other classrooms included some whole-group and some small-group instruction.

Division of labor. As in the cluster classes, the self-contained sixth-grade classes included little division of labor. Much of the time, students worked on their own to complete their assignments. Two notable exceptions to this general pattern occurred in the classes of Teachers 601 and 603. Both teachers required small groups of students to work together collaboratively to produce a single product in social studies. To complete these products, the students had to assume differentiated roles and responsibilities. Teacher 601 also used this procedure in science. These students were the only ones in all the classes who had to learn to share role responsibilities and learn mutual concern for product quality.

Table 2.3

Content and Grouping Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-Grade Self-Contained Classrooms

SCHOOL	CH Dana	Bluff Street		Hawthorne		
CLASSROOM	301	401	402	601	602	603
CONTENT AREA: Math	individualized	whole group	small group based on ability	small groups based on ability	whole group	whole group
CONTENT AREA: Reading	some whole group; some small group based on ability	whole group; 2-3 students to special teacher	small group based on ability	small groups based on ability	whole group	individualized; low readers to remedial teacher
CONTENT AREA: Health and Science	whole group	whole group	whole group	whole group; some small group, heterogeneous	whole group	whole group
CONTENT AREA: Language Arts	individualized	small groups based on ability for spelling; other whole group	whole group	whole group	whole group	whole group
CONTENT AREA: Social Studies	whole group	whole group	whole group	whole group; some small group, heterogeneous	whole group	small group based on reading ability
Physical Education	various small groups, heterogeneous	whole group	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
Art	small groups, heterogeneous	whole group	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
Silent Reading	not observed or discussed	whole group	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		

Student control. Table 2.4 reports the decisions and responsibilities related to the work over which students in the self-contained sixth-grade classrooms were given control. A wide variety of options were given to the students across the subject areas. These ranged from selection of which assignment to do from among several alternatives offered by the teacher, to pacing of when to do which parts of an assignment within a given day or week or across two or more weeks. Deciding whether or not to do extra-credit work also was an option available to the students. Students in Teacher 601's classroom wrote contracts stating what they planned to do each week in the various subjects. Thus, in these classes, students were expected to assume responsibility for as many, or more, aspects of their work than the students in the cluster classes. Further, the areas of control varied across the subject areas so the students in the self-contained classrooms had to interpret, understand, and respond to different control options across the school day. Placement in a self-contained classroom did not restrict the students' experience with this aspect of learning, compared with students in the cluster arrangements.

Evaluation. Evaluation in the self-contained classrooms followed much the same pattern as in the cluster classrooms. Behavior was evaluated negatively and publicly -- typically for disciplinary purposes. Academic evaluation was given in private written and oral exchanges between individual students and the teachers. In addition, Teachers 301, 401, 402, 601, and 602 frequently evaluated individual, as as well as whole-class academic performance publicly. Students who completed outstanding stories or projects were asked to present them to the other students. Teacher 601 used a chart on which stars were placed for high-quality work in Spelling. Whether the self-contained framework within these classes generated a group cohesiveness that made it possible to carry out such public academic evaluation activities while maintaining a cooperative intermixing of students of various performance levels is not known. It was one of the few areas of difference between the cluster and self-contained classrooms.

Student advancement. All the teachers in the self-contained classrooms controlled student advancement to new assignments and new content and skill areas in all subjects.

Summary

In summary, the sixth-grade activity structures may be described as complex and diverse. Across any given day in the sixth-grade classrooms, regardless of whether assigned to a cluster or self-contained arrangement, a sixth-grade student was required to understand and function successfully (a) in several different grouping arrangements, (b) with a variety of responsibilities for control of work completion, and, in some instances, (c) in collaborative group project endeavors. Interestingly, the greater diversity occurred in the self-contained classrooms, particularly those of Teachers 301, 401, 601, and 603. While the sixth-grade cluster arrangements provided students an opportunity to become accustomed to interacting with several different teachers during the school day, most of the self-contained classrooms

Table 2.4

Student Control Elements of Activity Structures in Sixth-grade Self-Contained Classrooms

SCHOOL	CH Dana	Bluff Street		Hawthorne		
CLASSROOM	301	401	402	601	602	603
CONTENT AREA: Math	selection of worksheet; pacing within the day	selection of assignment from kit, textbook, teacher created worksheets	pacing within day	none	none	none
CONTENT AREA: Reading	selection of work activity from available list	selection of workbook or reading kit; pacing over 3 days	pacing of work in kits over 3 weeks	choice of book to read	choice to do extra work to earn "A"	pacing over work
CONTENT AREA: Health and Science	selection of how to share products with class	decide whether to do project for extra credit	selection of materials to use in projects	pacing within day	pacing over 2 weeks; choice of extra work for higher grade	choice of extra work for higher grade
CONTENT AREA: Language Arts	selection among alternative assignments; selection of writing short story or doing book report	choice of idea to write about; length	spelling pacing over 2-3 weeks; other, pacing within day	selection of writing assignment to complete; none in spelling	spelling pacing within day	selection of activity from alternatives; pacing within week
CONTENT AREA: Social Studies	none	order of completion of booklet components; choice of resources to use	none	selection of topic for report within broad subject area assigned	choice of team member for project; pacing over 3 weeks	pacing within the week
CONTENT AREA: Physical Education	selection between team sport or free play	selection of activity	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
CONTENT AREA: Art	selection from among alternative activities	not observed or discussed	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		
CONTENT AREA: Silent Reading	not observed or discussed	selection of what to read	not observed or discussed	NOT OBSERVED OR DISCUSSED		

provided greater challenges in terms of structural diversity. Hence the success of students' transition to junior high school can be viewed from at least two elementary school dimensions. These are multiple teachers and multiple structures. Within the structural dimension, the variations in student control options offer yet another promising adaptation factor to pursue.

Seventh-Grade Activity Structures

Observations were conducted in the classes of 11 seventh-grade teachers at Waverley Junior High School. Three of these teachers taught two seventh-grade subject areas. The others taught only one seventh-grade subject. This sample included all the teachers who taught English and mathematics to the seventh-grade students. In addition, teachers who taught other seventh-grade subjects for two or more periods of the day were included. The observation schedule covered the first five weeks of the school year and the second week of November. The November observations were conducted so as to collect data in the classrooms at the time report cards were distributed for the first quarter.

Summaries of the activity structures used by the various seventh-grade teachers follow. More detailed descriptions are presented in Chapter Four. Prior to presenting the summaries, the school setting is described. This information is provided because previous discussions of secondary school activity structures (e.g., Bossert, 1978; and Westbury, 1978) suggest that, at this level, the school structure may be as potent as the class structures in terms of impact on student success.

Description of the School

Waverley Junior High School is one of two junior high schools serving a suburban-rural area with a total population of approximately 30,000 people. The school's service area is located at the outer edge of a large metropolitan region to which many of the residents commute for employment. Historically, the area has been agricultural and the numerous feed mills and agricultural supply stores that continue to operate in the area testify that many citizens still derive their livelihood from this sector of the economy.

Located at the intersection of one of the major north-south freeways in the state and a major street leading to the commercial center of the area, Waverley draws students from a demographic cross section of families ranging from upper-middle to lower-middle income. The other junior high in the school district, on the whole, serves a wealthier population.

The school facility is a rambling complex of several one story structures. The architectural design produces crowd-flow difficulties which, in turn, cause problems. The classrooms of the school

are located in three buildings, each containing eight to ten classrooms, which exit onto covered walkways. The buildings are placed parallel to one another about 30 feet apart. They are bisected by a hallway. At the end of each period, in order to reach either their next class, their lockers, or both, most of the school's 700 or so students must funnel through this hall, which is no more than 20 feet wide. To compound the problem, the lockers are stacked in two levels, an upper and a lower, along the sides of the hall. Students who have the upper lockers (usually eighth-graders) unintentionally -- or intentionally -- drop possessions on those with the lower lockers (usually seventh-graders). Further, as there are not enough lockers for all the students, some students have to share a single locker. Thus, even under the best of circumstances, the situation in this hall is impossible. At any given break between classes, the students' attempts to reach their lockers and their rapid movement across, up, and down the hall to get to the next classroom, inevitably lead to bumping and jostling. Students, teachers, and administrators all report that this hallway is the locus of many fights and much bullying. Attempts to resolve these problems, such as purchasing a bullhorn with an electronic whistle for the vice principal to use to direct traffic, have prevented only a few of the many confrontations that occur in this part of the school.

On the whole, the teachers and administrators at Waverley seemed concerned about control and safety issues both on and off campus. The administrators voiced concern to the researchers over fights, robberies, and molestations, most of which occurred after school. Several target students discussed the impact of theft and violence on their transition. In addition, parents were worried about the safety of their youngsters. During a "round table" discussion held on a September evening for seventh-grade parents, the researchers listened as school administrators and the parents carried on a frank, though never acrimonious, discussion of drugs, teenage pregnancy, and school-wide discipline problems. Altercations that occurred on the freeway overpass as the students went to and from school were cited as a major worry for the parents. Few classroom issues were raised, and these were all related to discipline.

While emphasizing discipline, the academic program appeared to have some areas where improvements could be made. For example, there was no seventh-grade science, and seventh-grade math seemed targeted for average and below-average students. Neither the individual teachers we observed nor the school as a whole made provision for students who already had mastered the seventh-grade math syllabus, nor was there a school-wide program for academically gifted students. The program at Waverley seemed to be designed around the needs of "the average" student.

The principal's comments at the preschool orientation for seventh-grade students and their parents indicated that "learning is not fun, but we do our best to make it enjoyable." This statement was followed by a few welcoming remarks by the head cheerleader and a rally led by the cheerleading squad -- all girls. The student government officers, members of the honor society, and the student chorus and

band were not included in the meeting. Hence, whether inadvertent or not, the opening program established the cheerleaders and the members of the athletic teams for whom they "cheered" as the new students' models toward which to strive. Academic success was not emphasized during the orientation meeting.

Within this general setting, the seventh- and eighth-grade program at Waverley was carried out.

Activity Structure Elements

The discussion that follows summarizes the various configurations of activity structure elements that were observed at Waverley. In those instances where one teacher taught more than one subject, information is presented for each subject area. A total of 140 observations were used to derive the desriptive summaries that follow. As noted earlier, more detailed information regarding the structures is presented in Chapter Four.

Content. Instruction at Waverley was departmentalized. Students moved from classroom to classroom and from teacher to teacher throughout the day. All seventh-grade students were required to study English, mathematics, world history, and physical education. Students who wished to do so could enroll in a foreign language class, either French, Spanish, or German. Students who did not enroll in foreign language enrolled in a reading skills class which was in addition to the regular English class. Generally, students with above-average talent and achievement in reading enrolled in foreign language and those with below average ability enrolled in the reading skills class.

Arts and crafts were combined into a year-long course labeled "block." This course consisted of one quarter each of art, music, home economics, and wood shop, each taught by a different teacher. Students rotated through these four courses during the course of the school year. Band and chorus also were offered as optional electives. Students enrolling in band or chorus were allowed to drop either reading or block from their schedules.

It is significant that science was not offered to the seventh-graders at Waverley.

Table 2.5 indicates which teachers taught the various subject areas. Teachers AB, AG, and AJ each taught two subject areas. The other teachers taught only one subject to seventh-grade students, although some of them also taught eighth-grade classes for one or more periods a day. Within a particular subject area, the departmental faculty appeared to reach some agreement on what content was to be taught. This is outlined below for each subject.

English. The general content of the seventh-grade English curriculum was set by the English department. The skill areas covered included reading, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, composition, and

Table 2.5

Content and Grouping Elements of Activity Structures in Seventh-Grade Classrooms

CONTENT	ENGLISH			MATHEMATICS			WORLD HISTORY		
TEACHER	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AJ	AB	AG	AJ
GROUPING	Two groups based on ability for reading, spelling, vocabulary. Whole group for grammar and composition	Two groups based on ability for reading, spelling, vocabulary. Whole group for grammar, composition, oral language	Two groups for reading, vocabulary. Whole group for grammar, composition, and oral language	Whole group	Whole group	Sometimes whole group	Whole group	Whole group	Whole group

READING		BLOCK		
AH	AI	AF	AK	AG
Five groups based on ability. Whole group one day a week	Whole group for most work. Small groups for reading kits assigned by student ability	Whole group but with individual student projects	Whole group for nutrition. Seven small groups for cooking	Whole group

oral language. The department faculty selected the textbooks to be used and attempted to establish guidelines regarding when a particular curricular area was to be taught. However, teacher preference altered the dictates of this departmental decision. For example, Teacher AB told one of the observers in her classes that she did not teach composition often because she did not know how to teach it well. Teacher AA was not observed teaching oral language expression. Teacher AC staggered the days on which he taught various skills to his respective classes.

Examination of the assignments students were given by the three teachers indicated that all three teachers assigned vocabulary words to the students each week. Students' knowledge of the words typically was tested by asking them to match a meaning that was written on the test sheet with the appropriate word.

The grammar lessons in all three classes were taken from the adopted text. At times the assignments involved worksheets prepared by the teacher or taken from an exercise packet that accompanied the text. According to the observer in Teacher AB's class, no attempt was made to link the grammar lessons to the vocabulary or reading assignments. This seemed to be the case in the other classes as well.

Reading material and comprehension exercises also were taken from the adopted texts. Most comprehension questions required short one- or two-word answers and were focused at a fact-recall level. The observer in Teacher AB's class emphasized the simplicity of the assignments. Teacher AA was noted to require his high-ability group, but not the other group, to go beyond mere recall in answering comprehension questions. For example, on one day the students were required to write a paragraph discussing their views of the outcomes of a story. In all classes, all students were required to write book reports on books of their choice.

Composition assignments were observed in all three classes, even though one teacher indicated little composition would be taught. Topics varied from descriptions of the students' own experiences to summaries of material that had been assigned during reading. Teacher AB had students write a rough draft, which she corrected, and then required a final version from the students. Such editing and rewriting was not observed in the other two classes.

Teachers AB and AC had the students interview one another during the first week of school. The students presented the results of their interviews to the whole class in a speech. The purpose was to introduce the person who had been interviewed to the other members of the class. No oral language experiences of this nature were observed in Teacher AA's class.

Thus, during the first quarter of the school year, it appeared that the work assigned to students in the English classes stressed fact-recall, short-answer responses. Even the composition assignments, with one or two exceptions, asked students to summarize material they already had read. Students were seldom required to analyze, synthesize, or apply in new contexts the skills and knowledge they had acquired.

Math. During the first quarter of the school year, the math content covered concepts and skills that can be found in a fifth- or sixth-grade text, e.g., whole number operations, sets, fractions, and simple word problems. The teachers followed the seventh-grade textbook, which repeated skills and knowledge that had already been mastered by a high proportion of the students. Moreover, this material, which constituted over 90 percent of the content presented in the Fall Quarter, did not appear to be treated in greater depth or more complexity than would be expected in fifth or sixth grade. For example, presentation of sets covered only intersection and union. The most complicated multiplication and division problems that were assigned were 89 X 76 and 3368 divided by 5.

There was no advanced math offered to seventh-grade students, nor did the teachers make arrangements for those seventh-graders who had successfully mastered the knowledge and skills listed above to advance to other, more difficult work (one exception was Student A27, who was placed in the eighth-grade general math class). Hence many students felt the math classes were too easy. Nonetheless, several sections of remedial math (math fundamentals) were offered. The content in these classes focused on basic computation skills that were even simpler than those covered in the regular classes.

World History. During Fall Quarter, this course covered the civilizations of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. Teachers AB, AG, and AJ covered the same civilizations and utilized similar assignments. Map work played an important role. Typically the assignments were based on commercially prepared materials that accompanied the textbook. The students were asked to read a printed passage about a particular civilization, answer factual questions based on the passage, locate key cities, etc., on a printed map, or identify rivers, etc., that were named on the map. Other assignments consisted of questions that asked the students to recall material presented in the textbook, Rise of the West. Many questions used a true and false or matching format. Students also were asked to make timelines that displayed major events that occurred during a particular civilization.

Teacher AB had a weekly current events assignment in which the students read and discussed a newspaper article or listened to and discussed an audio-recording of part of a radio or television newscast. Fact questions regarding the news topic of the week were given as a test on Fridays.

In Teacher AG's class, students who hoped to earn an "A" or "B" grade were required to submit a set of lecture notes for each civilization in addition to completing the map, timeline, and text assignments mentioned above.

Reading. Teachers AH and AI taught the reading skills classes. The goal of these classes was to improve the students' basic reading skills. Teacher AH divided the class into groups and rotated the groups through speed-reading exercises, vocabulary, comprehension, and silent reading. Each of these activities, except silent reading, included a written worksheet to be completed by the student.

Most worksheet content comprised fact recall questions and fill-in-the-blank sentences. In vocabulary, students were asked to match words to meanings that were listed on the assignment sheet. Once a week, the students met as a single group and worked with the teacher on development of critical reading skills, such as recognizing propaganda in news articles or advertising statements. The students also were assigned a book report. Since it was not due until the end of November, which was after the end of the first quarter, a student's performance on the book report was not reflected in the Fall Quarter grade he or she received.

Teacher AI used one group and taught comprehension, vocabulary, and spelling. Reading kits and other commercial materials were used for reading and comprehension assignments. Short, factual answers appeared to be stressed in these materials. Teacher AI assigned vocabulary and spelling words each week. Copying of dictionary definitions seemed to be the major vocabulary exercise. Students were tested on their knowledge of the vocabulary words by selecting from a list on the chalkboard the word that matched an oral definition given by the teacher. Teacher AI's students also were required to read and report on a book of their choice.

Block. This four-subject course included diverse content. Teacher AF, the art teacher, focused on doing art. His students were taught and used lettering skills to create graphic designs. They also learned and applied collage and mask-making skills. Teacher AK taught home economics. Nutrition and simple cooking skills were stressed in her course. The course had an academic aspect, as the students were were required to learn equivalent measures, safety rules, the names of cooking utensils, and the food groups. Again, short answer and true and false questions were used to measure students' knowledge of these facts. During cooking, the students worked in small groups to carry out cooking activities that had been planned by the teacher. Teacher AG taught music as an academic subject. In other words, the students studied about music rather than actually performing music. He covered the nature of sound, the origins of music, and note-reading skills. Typically, the students read a passage in the music textbook, then answered short answer, true-false, or matching questions based on the passage. No observations were conducted in the woodshop classes due to scheduling problems.

Summary. Across the six required periods in a school day, each seventh-grade student had an English, math, and world history class. Some students also had foreign language; some had reading skills. In addition, a few students might enroll in chorus or band. However, the preponderance of the students were in one of the block classes. All students also had a physical education class, none of which were observed.

Based on the above discussion and the more detailed information provided in Chapter Four, it appears that the assignments given to the seventh-grade students during the Fall Quarter stressed fact-recall, short-answer responses. In addition, the math content, in particular,

but also to some extent the grammar portion of the English content, repeated skills most students had mastered in elementary school. For those students requiring remedial assistance in math and reading, the courses that were offered appeared to stress even simpler skills. The descriptions of the classes in Chapter Four include comments by students in both the regular and remedial classes about the easiness of the work. Several students questioned the need to repeat content that they could show they knew if given an opportunity to take a mastery test. Whether or not this pattern continued for the remainder of the year is a matter of some interest. At least for one-fourth of the seventh-grade school year the curriculum did not appear to challenge or build the intellectual capabilities of the students.

Grouping. Referring back to Table 2.5, all teachers used whole-group instruction for all or part of the time in their classes. Hence a seventh-grade student often would experience six periods of whole-group instruction for several days in a row.

Teachers AF, AG, and AI used whole-group instruction exclusively. Teacher AB used only whole-group instruction in her world history class and for two days a week in her English classes. The other three days, she used two groups in English, formed according to ability. Teachers AA and AC repeated this same pattern in their English classes. Although the table lists Teachers AD, AE, and AJ as whole-group only, once or twice during the period of observation they broke their classes into two groups in order to have team competition for review purposes. Teacher AK used whole-group instruction for nutrition and small groups for cooking. Teacher AH taught the whole group of students one day a week and divided them into small groups based on ability the other days.

Division of labor. For all practical purposes, no division of labor was observed in the seventh-grade classes. All the students in the whole group, or in a particular small group, were given the same assignments. The students were to complete these assignments on their own. Generally, formal cooperation and collaboration were not required and informal cooperation and collaboration were discouraged. Occasionally, Teacher AJ would allow students to work together to produce a unit project. The cooking in Teacher AK's class required the students to carry out differentiated roles which the teacher assigned within each small group on a rotating basis. Thus the students had little opportunity to develop cooperative-collaborative interaction and planning skills as part of their seventh-grade experience.

Student control. Table 2.6 summarizes the opportunities students were given to control some aspect of their work. The most frequent form of student control that was observed involved granting students the opportunity to decide when and where to complete assignments, which is referred to as "control over pacing." For example, Teacher AA distributed his reading, spelling, and vocabulary assignments on Monday of each week. Most of this work was due on Friday, so the students had control over the time and place in which they did the various tasks as long as they were completed by Friday of

Table 2.6

Student Control Element of Activity Structures in Seventh-Grade Classrooms

CONTENT	ENGLISH			MATHEMATICS			WORLD HISTORY		
TEACHER	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AJ	AB	AG	AJ
STUDENT CONTROL	Pacing of work on assignments as long as finished by end of week	Rare. Sometimes control over order in which assigned tasks were done	None	Pacing, students could finish work at home	None	None	Pacing of work on unit as long as completed by due date. Order of which part of unit to do first	Pacing, could finish work at home	Pacing and order of tasks within unit over two-week period. Grade for which to work

READING		BLOCK		
AH	AI	AF	AK	AG
Pacing of work so long as completed by due date	Number of vocabulary words to do	None	Choice of members of cooking group	Pacing within two or three week art project timeline. Choice of project content within design requirements

each week. Teacher AJ handed out unit assignments that included several different tasks with due dates up to two weeks away. Teacher AF's art projects were due two or three weeks after he assigned them. Teacher AH distributed a vocabulary assignment on Monday that was due Friday. Teachers AD and AG allowed students to complete at home any work they did not complete in class. Generally, this work was due the next day. By granting such control over pacing, these teachers allowed the students to use the in-class time provided for completion of the assignments for other pursuits. Consequently, early in the assignment timeline, observers saw students talking with one another or doing work for other classes, rather than the assigned work for that particular class. As due dates neared, more time was spent on class-specific assignments.

Teachers AH and AJ linked the amount of work done by a student to the grade the student might receive. Teacher AH had stacks of extra credit work -- crossword puzzles, word searches, and so forth -- which were required of anyone desiring an "A" or "B" grade. Students satisfied with a "C" or lower did not have to complete this extra work. With each unit, Teacher AJ handed out a list of the assignments required for each grade. Students chose the grade for which they wished to strive by completing the required work. To obtain an "A" or "B" in this class necessitated completion of an inordinant amount of work.

Some seventh-grade teachers allowed very little student control over work activities. Teacher AI allowed her reading skills students to choose between learning 10 or 20 vocabulary words. Teacher AK permitted her home economics students to select the members of their cooking groups.

In sum, the seventh-grade students were expected to assume considerable responsibility for pacing their work on lengthy assignments so they would have all the tasks completed by the due date. Otherwise, few responsibilities were given to the students. Two notable exceptions were Teachers AH and AJ, who provided a system whereby students could elect the letter grade for which they would work on an assignment. Unfortunately, this extra work generally was more of the same activities done for the lower grades. Working for a higher grade seldom required a student to carry out more complex and challenging learning activities.

Evaluation. All teachers in the sample evaluated their students' nonacademic behavior publicly and negatively for purposes of behavioral control. It was not the purpose of the evaluations that differed; it was the results. For example, Teachers AB, AG, and AJ had reputations for being "strict." As the students said, they did not allow "messing around." While aloof and withdrawn behind his dark glasses, Teacher AH also tolerated little student foolishness and misbehavior. Teacher AA was also firm, but, unlike the other teachers, he used humor, drama, and other quasi-charismatic techniques, as well as punishment, to maintain classroom order.

Teacher AD, on the other hand, was completely ineffectual in behavior control. In his classes, as is detailed in Chapter Four of

this volume and in the case descriptions of Students A5 and A23, classroom order collapsed into chaos and classroom management ceased to exist. A brief quote from an observer's narrative description provides a glimpse of a typical day in Teacher AD's class:

> The noise from the students continues. One student starts singing the "Star Spangled Banner," and several others join in. Next, someone starts with the "Pledge of Allegiance." Everyone picks that up until it has gone around the room.

Further, Teacher AD was the only teacher who used total class reprimands, rather than directing his comments to the student who was misbehaving. He would make comments such as, "I wonder if we are going to have to send someone out. The minute you disturb this class, out you go." The teachers whose behavior control was more effective directed their comments to the specific student who was misbehaving. Being forceful and consistent seemed to be required to have the students respond to group management rules and regulations.

The teachers who were successful at maintaining classroom order, in general, were respected by their students. Teacher AJ was described by students as "nice" and "fun" as well as "strict." The observer found that Teacher AG and his students respected one another. One student indicated the class was "fun," another said Teacher AG was his "buddy," even though he allowed little talking or mobility in his classes. In contrast, students in Teacher AD's class did not respect him. One student said, "He's not even considered a teacher, sometimes, the way he acts."

Thus teachers who evaluated behavior publicly and personally and punished miscreants in a firm and consistent way had well managed classrooms and gained their students' respect; perhaps even their affection.

Academic evaluation at Waverley was found to be more private and more subdued than was the behavioral evaluation. Most academic evaluation was written on corrected papers or was given in the form of grades on report cards. Teachers attempted to explain to their students the criteria used for grading (see Chapter Four). While the clarity of these explanations varied across the teachers, most of the high-achieving students seemed to know the basis for earning a particular grade. The low-achieving students often were confused or had little or no idea what criteria were applied. Yet both groups of students had been party to the same explanations.

In any case, grades and comments on students' academic performances were generally written on completed work and therefore communicated privately. However, in some classes, where students corrected one another's work or where completed projects were displayed, students had opportunities to judge the performance of various individuals. Further, since all the classes included teacher-led question-and-answer sessions as a regular instructional procedure, the

students had ample opportunity to determine who knew the answers and who did not. As a result, most students could identify the "dummies" and the "smart" students in their classes.

Student advancement. While all the teachers controlled student advancement to a new content or skill area, most teachers allowed the students to work through an assignment within a particular area with no intermediate checks with the teacher. Only Teacher AF, the art teacher, required mid-assignment checks. He structured art projects so that students submitted their designs or sketches for approval before proceeding with the final product.

Other than the inability to move to new content until the entire class or small group was deemed ready by the teacher, the primary restraint on student advancement was the length of the assignment. Some teachers, such as Teachers AA, AJ, and AF, gave long-term assignments, which allowed the students to work for several days or weeks without checking with the teacher. Other teachers, such as Teachers AG, AD, and AE, gave assignments that were due the same day or the next morning.

In the classes of Teachers AH and AK, the limited access to the teaching equipment forced the students to finish their work by the end of the period.

Summary

On the one hand, the data regarding Waverley Junior High School and the seventh-grade activity structures warrant the conclusion that the architectural arangement of the school presented several mobility and student interaction problems to the entering seventh-graders. On the other hand, the structures used to organize instruction in the seventh-grade classrooms were neither varied nor complex. For example, a student might go for several days experiencing only whole-group instruction. There was little division of labor observed in any class. For the most part, student control was restricted to control over pacing, a necessary result of assignments that lasted longer than one day. Student control over the content of an assigned activity was evident only in two classes, and, in these classes, the items over which students had control -- the number of vocabulary words and whether or not to do extra credit -- seemed trivial. Only Teachers AJ and AH granted the students any substantial control over their academic experience. They allowed them to choose the amount of work they would do, which, in turn, was linked to the grade they would earn for a particular unit or assignment. Student advancement to new content always was dependent on the teacher deciding that the whole or small group was ready to move on, at which time the new content area was introduced.

Surprisingly, the demands imposed on the students by the seventh-grade structures were no more, and perhaps even less, complex than those imposed by the structures in which the students had worked in sixth grade.

Comparison of Sixth- and Seventh-Grade Activity Structures

Earlier in this chapter, some notions were presented regarding the ways in which sixth- and seventh-grade activity structures might differ. This section of the chapter brings together the summaries presented above to highlight the similarities and differences that were found. In addition, three scenarios are presented to illustrate the impact of these differences on the demands to which a student would be expected to respond on a given school day.

Activity Structure Elements That Were Similar

Two elements of the sixth- and seventh-grade activity structures were similar. These were evaluation and student advancement.

With regard to student evaluation, all teachers used primarily public, negative evaluation to control student behavior that did not conform to classroom rules and norms. Judgments of academic performance on papers, tests, or report cards, however, were conveyed privately in the form of written grades and comments. The extent to which the students shared these grades and comments with other students was left to each student's discretion.

Within this general framework, some teachers, particularly those at the sixth-grade level, varied from the private academic evaluation pattern from time to time. For example, at times, Teacher 302 complemented or scolded the entire group of students about the quality of their work. In addition, students who completed exemplary stories or projects were asked to present them to the entire student group in several sixth-grade classes. Teacher 601 used a chart on which students who did well in spelling placed a star by their names for the week.

Fewer exceptions to the general academic evaluation procedures occurred in seventh grade. One strategy that was used to correct papers required students to trade papers and correct one another's work. When this occurred, information about the students' performances soon spread among the group.

In many classes, the grouping arrangements also indicated who were the higher or lower ability students. Recitations, which occurred almost daily in most seventh-grade classes, made the students' ability to respond correctly to the teachers' questions public information. Seating arrangements also pointed out the students who were having problems in the class. This was particularly obvious in the JM Keynes sixth-grade cluster, but also occurred in the seating assignments of one or two students in other classes.

Nonetheless, for the most part, neither the sixth- nor the seventh-grade teachers publicly announced grades, the number of correct or incorrect answers, etc., attained by an individual student. In contrast, social behavior -- more specifically, inappropriate social behavior -- received frequent public attention in all classes.

Likewise, student advancement to a new assignment within a content or skill area or to a new area was handled in a similar fashion in both the sixth and seventh grades. All students were dependent on the teacher to advance. At both grade levels, this practice meant that students who had control over the pacing of their work would complete assignments early and wait for others to finish. Other students would have to rush to be ready to move on with the teacher. This was a larger problem in classes where all instruction was whole-group than those where small groups were used. Some teachers used extra-credit work as "filler." Unfortunately, extra-credit work typically was more of the same activities the students already had completed, rather than more complex or varied learning tasks.

Finally, a few teachers at both grade levels afforded students an opportunity to opt to do extra-credit work. Teacher AJ, in her seventh-grade world history classes, specified the work requirements to receive a particular letter grade on a unit; then students could decide the grade toward which they would work.

Activity-Structure Elements That Differed

Four activity structure elements were implemented in different forms, placing different demands on the students in sixth grade compared with seventh grade. These elements were content, grouping, division of labor, and student control.

Given that, (a) the students were younger and less experienced when they were in sixth grade, (b) the junior high might be expected to provide a more rigorous academic setting, and (c) sixth grade, in part, can be viewed as preparation for seventh grade, it seems logical that seventh grade would be more academically varied and have more complex activity structures than sixth. However, the data for the sixth- and seventh-grade classes in this study suggest that, on the whole, the opposite occurred. The students who attended Waverley Junior High School were required to meet less complex activity structures' demands in seventh grade than in sixth in several areas.

For example, in terms of course content, Waverley's course offerings included foreign language and arts and crafts, which were not present in the elementary schools. The elementary schools, however, offered science, which was not offered to seventh-graders. Since science often is a subject in which students have an opportunity to become involved in problem solving and experimentation, by not offering this course to seventh-grade students, Waverley limited their opportunity to engage in this learning experience. Further, there is little doubt that the sixth-grade math program better provided for the students' needs and abilities than did the seventh-grade program, which was a review of the fifth- and sixth-grade syllabus, at least for the first quarter of the year.

Grouping practices, too, were simpler in the seventh grade than in the sixth. Sixth-grade teachers in both the clusters and the self-contained classrooms, with the exception of only one teacher, mixed

whole- and small-group instruction within, and across, subject areas. In addition, at this level, small-group instruction often was linked with other activity-structure elements, such as division of labor (e.g., a small group of students working on a single project together) or student control over what was to be produced. Hence, because grouping of students in sixth-grade classes sometimes combined students of similar ability and sometimes students of heterogeneous ability, students not only had learning experiences that more nearly matched their ability level, they also were required to learn to work with various combinations of students to accomplish diverse types of learning outcomes.

In contrast, in the seventh grade, except for the groups in Teacher AK's home economics class, when grouping occurred it always was based on student ability. Further, the groups were given assignments that were indistinguishable in terms of the tasks to be done. The only variation was in the difficulty of the vocabulary words, spelling words, or reading books that were part of the assignment. Thus, even in the few seventh-grade classes where grouping occurred -- the English classes, Teacher AH's reading skills class, and Teacher AK's home economics class -- the probable consequence of the structure was not to increase the variety of curricular and learning experiences available to the students, but to set up explicit criteria for status attainment and thus indicate to the entire class which students were the "dummies" in the "easy work" group (cf., Weinstein, 1981).

For all practical purposes, division of labor did not occur in the seventh-grade classes. All the students in the whole, or small, groups were given the same assignments. The students carried out the assignments on their own. Teacher AD's small-group cooking assignments, in which she assigned differentiated roles to the students on a rotating basis, were the one notable exception to the general structure. Occasionally, Teacher AJ allowed, but did not require, students to work together on a world history project.

In contrast, some of these students had had extensive experience with collaborative learning activities in the sixth grade. For example, in the CH Dana cluster, Teacher 303 placed students together in small groups to create and produce dramatic skits. Teacher 302 had teams of students work on science and social studies projects. However, in this class, each student on the team was required to prepare his or her own separate report of the outcomes of the team's efforts, rather than a single team report. Teachers 601 and 603 also required small groups of students to work together collaboratively in social studies. These groups produced a single product. Teacher 601 used the same procedures in science.

Relative to student contol over various aspects of classroom work activity, students again were required to accept more responsibility for their learning in sixth than in seventh grade. Most teachers at both grade levels gave the students some control over the pacing of their work. In seventh grade, students frequently were given assignments that were to be completed within one, two, or three weeks. They

were responsible for doing the work and turning it in at the specified date. Interestingly, sixth-grade students were expected to meet the same demands. Several teachers in both the cluster and self-contained classrooms utilized student control over pacing within similar time-frames in several subject matter areas.

In addition, in sixth grade the students were given numerous opportunities to select which of several alternative learning activities they would complete in order to demonstrate their knowledge and skill. These options ranged from selection of workbook or reading-kit activities in reading, to selection of project content and form in several subject areas. This type of choice occurred rarely in seventh grade.

On the whole, therefore, it appears that a student from one of the elementary schools in the Waverley attendance area most likely had to respond to, and function appropriately in, more complex structures in his or her sixth-grade classes than in his or her seventh-grade classes. The hypothetical scenarios that follow -- for a cluster sixth-grade setting, a self-contained setting, and a seventh-grade setting -- illustrate this point.

Illustrative Scenarios

A typical daily program in each of the three settings listed above is described below.

Cluster setting. For purposes of illustration, the CH Dana cluster is used. This cluster included four teachers who shared instruction for some 120 fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students. All classes were multigrade. The students rotated as a group from teacher to teacher throughout the day.

Students spent the first period of the day in their homeroom class. Assuming one were in Teacher 303's homeroom, the day would begin with attendance and opening exercises. Then the students would move to work in science, social studies, drama, or art. If the day's topic were science, the students would be formed into heterogeneous small groups by the teacher. Each group would go to an assigned activity center where an experiment would be conducted. To perform the experiment, the students would be required to work together, each student handling different instruments, taking different measures, etc. When the experiment was completed, each student would be required to write up his or her own report of what was done and learned by the group. If the experiment was not completed at the end of the work period, the same group of students would return to it the next day. Due dates for experiment reports would vary, depending on the complexity of the task.

After working on science for 45 minutes or so, the students would leave Teacher 303's classroom and move to Teacher 302's room. Here the subject was language arts, including creative writing, spelling, and grammar. In contrast to the fairly interdependent group work in the previous class, here students would work almost entirely in a whole-group setting. Unless the students were doing creative writing, where

some choice over topic was permitted, no student choice would be allowed. Teacher 302 typically would assign specific worksheets to be completed during a given class period.

The next class might be Teacher 304's reading class, which also included study of vocabulary and phonics. Here the period would begin with a few minutes of silent reading, each student reading a book of his or her choice. Next the students would break into small groups based on ability. Each group would be given an assigment that differed markedly from those given the other groups. If the day's topic were reading, the students would read the text assigned to their group and answer questions or exercises provided by the publisher. If the day's assignment were devoted to vocabulary or phonics, each student would work on one of the lessons in a vocabulary or phonics sequence assigned to his or her group. Generally, this sequence of lessons would encompass a six-week period. The student would be able to decide how rapidly to move through the materials as long as he or she completed all the lessons by the due date.

The final class of the morning would be Teacher 303's math class. Students also were assigned to ability groups in this class. However, exceptional students were not assigned to a group; they were allowed to work on their own. Each group received a packet of assignments on Monday. The students would decide which parts of the packet to complete on which day of the week. All work was to be completed by Friday. Occasionally, Teacher 305 allowed the students to choose which of several alternative packets they would do.

After lunch, the students would return to their homeroom, where they had a study hall period to finish incomplete assignments that were due that day in any of their classes. During the afternoon, they also had a physical education period with their homeroom teacher and were able to view filmstrips and do other activities that were set up at various centers in the four classrooms. This latter time afforded the students informal opportunities to work with other students and to make a variety of choices regarding what they would do and how they would do it.

Self-contained classroom. Using Teacher 601's class as an example of the structures in which sixth-grade students worked in a self-contained classroom setting, the following scenario would occur.

Students in this class each negotiated contracts with the teacher that specified the amount of work each would complete during the week. Each day, the students were responsible for working on portions of their contracts and keeping a record of the work they had accomplished. In addition, there were four activity centers around the room, one each for math, reading, language arts, and social studies. Many of the activities the students included in their contracts were carried out at the centers. While the students worked at their desks and the centers, the teacher summoned one small group at a time to work with her.

The day might begin with reading. Each contract might specify a variety of work including: working in the SRA kit, a book report,

free reading, or other assignments. Students worked individually on their contracted reading tasks. Teacher 601 discouraged working together. Each subject area period lasted from 30 minutes to an hour, depending on the work to be done. After reading, the next subject might be language. Here all the students would have the same work to complete during the week. Grammar, spelling, and creative writing might be included in the week's assignments. Anyone who had difficulty was free to approach the teacher for assistance. The teacher appeared to have a clear idea of each student's progress rate and special needs.

During math, the students worked in groups appropriate to their ability. Again, for this part of the day, the teacher specified what was to be done.

Next the students would move to study of social studies or science. Sometimes the students worked by themselves in these subjects, and sometimes they worked in groups, collaborating on a project to present to the whole class. Students might have choices regarding the topic on which they would work and how they scheduled their work throughout the week.

Reading, language, math, and social studies or science generally consumed the entire school day. However, the routine might be broken by physical education, a joint activity with another class, or a whole-class art or music activity.

As suggested by the contracts and the week-long work periods, students in Teacher 601's class were required to assume considerable responsibility for their work activities. They also experienced variety in their activity structures. The latter is demonstrated by the presence of division of labor in some small-group work, but not in other work, and the choice and pacing responsibilities implied by the negotiation of weekly contracts for some subjects, but not others.

A day at Waverley Junior High School. A student at Waverley had six classes throughout the day, each about 45 minutes long. Below is a description of four typical classes, three of them required -- math, English, and world history -- and one elective -- music, part of the elective block program of art, music, home economics, and wood shop. Students were also required to take PE, and might take either reading or foreign language. Some students took band or chorus instead of the block electives.

Assuming that a student's schedule began with Teacher AJ's world history class, the day would begin with one of two formats. On some days Teacher AJ would lead the class in a recitation, students would read aloud, or the teacher would lecture. Either of the last two activities was followed by a question-and-answer period. During these class sessions, students were required to remain in their seats and were not allowed to talk to one other. Teacher AJ was known not to "mess around" about discipline. On other days students worked on their assignments which were distributed about two weeks before they were due. Teacher AJ determined what was in the assignments. A student could determine the grade he or she wished to receive by the

amount of work that was completed. While working, students might sit with friends and talk quietly or approach the teacher for help. There was no small-group work in this class.

Moving to math for the next period, the student would enter a situation where everything was straightforward. If the student were in Teacher AD's class, the teacher would present an assignment to the students that they were to finish during the period, or by the beginning of the next day's class at the latest. There were no student choices. No small groups were used. As Teacher AD could not, or would not, control the class, the atmosphere was one of chaos. Teacher AD had withdrawn as much as possible from contact with the students. Therefore, students could not obtain help from him.

With English as a third-period class, a student in Teacher AB's class would find that both whole and small groups might be used. Whole groups were used for grammar instruction and for occasional writing assignments. Two small groups were used for reading, spelling, and vocabulary. However, since the small groups never met together, the curricular experience for the students was no different from the whole-group arrangements described in the history and math classes. All that differed was the content (not the form) of the assignments given the two groups. Students had no choices and never worked together to complete an assignment. While readily available to help students, Teacher AB dominated the class, leading the class in recitation, insisting on single explanations of complex assignment routines and procedures, and requiring students to stand when they recited.

With music as the next class, a student might anticipate some change in activity structure and demands. However, in the block program at Waverley, Teacher AG taught music as an academic course in music theory. No listening to music, playing instruments, or singing was observed. The class was taught as one group. Teacher AG's activities included students reading aloud from a text, teacher lectures, and seatwork due on the next day at the latest. During seatwork, Teacher AG was available to answer students' questions. No small-group activities, no division of labor, and no opportunities for the students to assume responsibility for various facets of their work were observed.

Summary. Inasmuch as the four Waverley classes described above are typical of a student's day at Waverley, the contrast between the students' sixth- and seventh-grade experience is striking. In the sixth grade, students had control over the content of their work in several subject areas. Assignments were frequently long-term, some due as much as six weeks after they had been assigned. Several times during the day students rotated between working in small groups, selected either on the basis of ability or interest, and large groups. Sometimes the small groups worked together on a project. Often they met with the teacher for instructional purposes. In short, there was variety, complexity, and responsibility built into the structures of the sixth-grade classes.

In contrast, at Waverley, variety, complexity, and responsibility tended to be replaced with repetition, uniformity, and teacher-directed instruction. Except in Teacher AJ's class, a student in the four Waverley classes described above would have little choice and no long-term assignments. Addition of the other four subjects -- physical education, foreign language, reading skills, or chorus -- would not change this pattern to any great extent. In none of these classes were students required to interact collaboratively with peers for academic purposes. What is more, the seventh-grade teachers seldom varied their routine. Students could expect the same type of assignments and the same interactional demands day after day. Compared with the requirements of the sixth-grade activity structures, these students went backward when they entered junior high school. At Waverley, they were required to utilize a small repertoire of cognitive and social skills and were placed in an educational environment where the academic demands were bland, if not boring.

Yet, even though the activity structures in the classes at Waverley were more alike than different, the observations of target students in their seventh-grade classes suggest that some students functioned differently in one class compared to another. To identify possible explanations for the changes in student participation from class to class, we looked inside the structures. The results of this analysis are presented next.

Inside the Seventh-Grade Activity Structures

Thus far, the discussion of the seventh-grade activity structures has emphasized the similarity of the structures in the classes observed at Waverley. However, based on the student transition data (see Volume IV), it appears that placement in classrooms with similar structures did not necessarily result in similar learning experiences for students. Teacher behavior within the structures seems to have created different learning environments and different learning experiences. Based on the data reported in the in-depth descriptions of the seventh-grade teachers' activity structures (see Chapter Four), four within-activity-structure features seem to contribute to these differences. These are:

- The extent to which the teacher was accessible to the students to help them with assigned tasks and provide feedback and reinforcement.
- The clarity of the teacher's directions and explanations.
- The extent to which the teacher stressed only content coverage or also attended to students' interest in the assigned tasks.

- The degree to which the teacher established and maintained classroom rules and norms and focused disciplinary actions on the individual(s) who did not conform to these expectations, rather than using large-group sanctions.

Across the seventh-grade classes some teachers exhibited all these features; some only one or two. A discussion follows of the teachers' use of each instructional feature.

Teacher Accessibility

Since the original data collection focused on the activity structure elements rather than the instructional features that were used within the structures (which were identified post hoc), the fact that instructional feature data are missing in some classes strengthens the value of a feature that is noted as present or absent in a particular class. It surfaced as worth mentioning above and beyond the attention given to the activity structure elements. Thus, features that are mentioned for a particular teacher can be interpreted as having a marked influence on the students' experience in that classroom.

Teachers differed in the extent to which they were accessible so students could obtain help and reinforcement. The narrative descriptions of classroom interactions, the observers' comments regarding the various teachers, and the students' interview comments suggest that six teachers made themselves available to help individual students with their work -- particularly during seatwork periods -- while three did not. No specific information was provided regarding this feature for two teachers.

Relative to accessibility, Teacher AA was among those teachers who were available to help students. The observer commented, "Teacher AA has a nice way of working with students as he goes around to give individual help . . . he doesn't give them the answer, but he gives them hints and encouragement and expects them to find the answer on their own." Target Student A13 stated, "He'll talk to you and he'll ask you if you need any special help . . . he'll try to explain to you what you don't understand."

Similarly, students felt that Teacher AB was available if they needed help. Student A6 indicated that when he raised his hand, "Teacher AB will come, or you just go up to her desk and ask her." Student A11 reported, "Well, if she's not busy, you can go up and talk to her, or you can go after school, too."

Most students also felt that Teacher AE was accessible. Student A13 said, "She helps whoever raises their hand and needs help." Student A11 echoed these comments, saying, "She gives help to anybody who needs it." The observer described Teacher AE moving about from student to student during much of each class period. The narrative descriptions included statements in which Teacher AE told the students, "If you need help, I'll try to help you."

In Teacher AF's art class, the observer noted that the teacher had a system in which students brought their projects to him to be reviewed when they were at the "sketch" stage and again when the projects were completed. Teacher AF used these opportunities to make suggestions on various aspects of the work.

Teacher AG was described as follows by Student A24:

> You raise your hand and he will come over to you and [you] ask him how to do this, or [say] I don't understand or something. Then he will help you and tell you what it means and sometimes give you the answers.

Regarding Teacher AJ, the observer stated:

> Teacher AJ is up on her feet circulating almost constantly. She's not only available to talk to students who come to her; she goes around and makes a point of talking to them. Everyone in the class talks to her several times even if they don't approach her.

The three teachers who were pointed out as not being accessible to the students were Teachers AD, AH, and AI. Numerous students commented regarding Teacher AD's failure to help them. For example, Student A25 reported, "You raise your hand. You sit there for five minutes. He just looks at you." Student A18 stated:

> You'll ask him a question, like I raised my hand . . . and I go, like, "It's wrong, I don't understand what's happening."
> And he [Teacher AD] goes, "Well, you did it wrong," and put my paper down and left.
> I knew I did it wrong. I just wanted to know what I did wrong.

Relative to Teacher AH, the observer indicated, "Teacher AH never tried to relate with his students on a one-to-one basis." Further, the observer noted that Teacher AH's habit of wearing dark sunglasses in the classroom appeared to emphasize his remoteness, excluding as they did any possibility of eye contact between him and the students. Teacher AH's pattern of turning on a portable radio when the warning bell rang five minutes before the end of the period also seemed to signal to the students that he was not interested in interacting with them.

An excerpt from the descriptive narrative for an observation period in Teacher AI's class suggests that she, too, failed to help the students. The observer stated, "The teacher gives no comment to those pupils who look expectantly at her with their hands raised . . . she just ignores them."

The observation narratives in Teacher AC's and Teacher AK's classes, as well as the interviews with the target students in their classes, make no reference to accessibility. This may be due to the fact that the presence or absence of this instructional feature did not stand out in these two classes, or it could be a result of scheduling conflicts, as these teachers' classes were observed less than the others and included few target students. As a result, the opportunity for accessibility to be described may have been restricted, particularly because it was not the focus of the observations and interviews.

Clarity

A second feature within the activity structures that emerged from the obervations and student interviews concerned the clarity or vagueness of teachers' directions and explanations. Both student and observer comments addressed in one way or another the clarity with which academic expectations were presented, as well as the way in which the teacher explained the tasks to be accomplished, described a new concept, or introduced new information.

It is important to note that data regarding this feature were included in less than half the teacher case descriptions. No reference was made to clarity in six teacher descriptions (Teachers AC, AE, AF, AK, AI, and AJ). Positive statements occurred for Teachers AA, AG, and AH. Negative statements were reported in the descriptions of Teachers AB and AD.

Positive comments were made regarding the way Teacher AA explained his grading system to the students. The observer noted, "Academic standards were laid out with some explicitness at the beginning of the year. The grading criteria for work on the assignment sheets were discussed with the students." The observer also described Teacher AA illustrating how to complete particular assignments by doing example tasks on the chalkboard. Several times, the observer noted the students correcting Teacher AA because the teacher's illustrations did not meet the criteria he had set for "good" work, e.g., answer a question using a complete sentence.

Relative to Teacher AG, Student A22 stated:

> Like when he talks, he knows what he's talking about. He explains it real clear and makes it kind of better for us to understand.

Teacher AH laid out the routine he intended to have the students follow:

> I establish a routine so that students really know that they go to the same place in the room at the same time and that the same assignment is going to be due in a certain place at a certain time. In establishing these kinds of routines, my goal is to have students realize that routines are ends

> in themselves and can be a help in accomplishing goals of their own, particularly goals related to schoolwork.

The observations described this sytem in operation.

In contrast, the observer in Teacher AB's class commented:

> There were a lot of instructions given at the beginning of a period. Sometimes instructions for three or four different kinds of activities were given at once . . . It was apparent that many students were not able to follow the instructions or remember them. Many, many questions usually resulted.

Student A22 further noted that Teacher AB used "big words" to talk about "stuff" the students didn't know. She reported that when this occurred, the students went to one another to seek explanations in "small" words so it was easier to understand.

Students also made negative comments regarding the clarity of Teacher AD's instruction, although these comments were not as negative as those made regarding other features. One student said, "I don't know what he likes." Another said, "I don't listen to him."

Thus clarity stood out as an important positive feature in only three teachers' classes (AA, AG, and AH). It was not mentioned in six classes (Teachers AC, AE, AF, AK, AI, and AJ). It was viewed as an area warranting improvement in the classes of Teachers AB and AD.

Interest and Content Coverage

The majority of the seventh-grade teachers approached teaching from what might be termed a "context" orientation. Coverage of curricular content was of major concern to these teachers. They defined the academic work to be done based on the material to be taught. However, given this instructional perspective, some teachers were concerned about maintaining their own, as well as the students', interest in the content; others were not. For this latter group, assignment of the work appeared, by definition, to make it worth doing. Whether the students were interested in it was of little concern to them.

Among the teachers who gave attention to maintenance of interest, a variety of strategies was observed. The narrative descriptions of Teacher AA's interactions with the students in his various classes include numerous examples of Teacher AA using humor and drama to keep students attentive and on task. The observer noted that he often referred to assignments as "handy-dandy Teacher AA helper sheets" or "something really special." Teacher AC alternated the day of the week on which students in the various periods did a certain task. As he noted, this kept him fresh, since he did not teach the same content and go through the same assignments six times a day. In turn, he felt

he could make the teaching-learning processs more interesting for the students each period.

Teacher AE worked against difficult odds to make her math assignments interesting. Although she attempted to instill in her students an understanding of the importance of mathematics in contemporary culture, the content overlap with fifth- and sixth-grade, in general, made the work easy and dull for the students. Student A7 stated, "In math, we're learning division, which we already know. The only thing I've learned new in math [is] casting out nines." Nonetheless, Teacher AE challenged the students by the large amount of review work assigned. Student A11 said the hardest part of Teacher AE's class was the amount of work. Student A9 stated, "It's not too hard. It's just kind of tiring to work all of those times."

Teacher AF's art classes differed from the other classes in the lack of emphasis on reading, writing, and discussion. The time spent in this class provided a break in the lecture/discussion, seatwork for math that predominated in the other subject areas. The assigned art activities appeared to interest the students. Likewise, the cooking activities in Teacher AK' home economics classes stimulated students' interest. However, the nutrition assignments were marked by a lack of attention to activities that might have made them interesting.

Teacher AJ spoke to her students about the joys and significance of history and explained why its study was important. She also established a grading system that allowed students to select the grade that they wished to achieve. Student A27 described the system:

> She tells you what you can go for: "A," "B," "C," or "D" . . . and you have to do certain things for that grade . . . I like it; it's different than what all my other teachers have done.

Even though the work to achieve an "A" grade generally was more of the same sort of work required to earn a "C," the students seemed to be motivated to perform. Student A21 noted, "I guess it makes you want to work, you know? I know I can get good grades if I really try."

As noted above, the repetition of math content contributed to students' expressing a lack of interest in their math classes. The discussion of Teacher AE's attempts to motivate her students already referenced this problem. While Teacher AE used lengthy assignments and discussion of the importance of math to attempt to alleviate some of the problems, Teacher AD made little effort to do so. Students A14 and A28 called the work "easy." Student A6 said, "A lot of the stuff's review." Student A23 stated, "This class is just like kindergarten. We don't do anything."

Students who were enrolled in the reading skills classes expressed similar feelings about the easiness of the assignments. This attitude was particularly prevalent in Teacher AI's classes. For

example, the observer recorded several times in one class period when Teacher AI told students who complained about the simplicity of the work that she didn't care, they still had to do the assignment. Student A13 felt that things were not much better in Teacher AH's class:

> First, I had Teacher AI but they transferred me 'cause she was too easy. Now I'm in Teacher AH's, but he's way too easy, too; it's not even a challenge.

Student A5, who also was in one of Teacher AH's reading skills classes, reported that reading was easier than his other classes.

The narrative descriptions of Teacher AB's classes present a dilemma relative to student interest. On the one hand, the observer in her English classes remarked that Teacher AB made "very little effort to motivate the interests and creativity of the students." On the other, by the end of September, in her history classes, the observers noted that Teacher AB was engaging in more oral recitations with the students and "the students seem more lively, more interested, and are definitely participating more in the work now than they were at the beginning of the year." Hence, as might be expected, when the content itself was new to the students (as in history), Teacher AB appeared to be able to generate student interest in the material to be covered. In English, where much of the work resembled content and procedures that the students had experienced in elementary school, Teacher AB appeared to be less successful in maintaining their interest.

Teacher AG was observed during one of the periods when he taught seventh-grade music and one when he taught world history. The world history observation narratives and interviews make no reference to students' interest in the content and assignments or Teacher AG's efforts to build such interest. The observer in the music class found an unexpected lecture-seatwork format in which the teacher led a recitation and then students completed a seatwork assignment. Talking and reading about music was stressed rather than performing music or listening to music performed by others. Although no specific comments were made in the case description regarding students' interest in the assigned tasks, observer statements such as those mentioned above alluded to a dull situation.

Discipline

Teachers' success in obtaining students' conformance to classroom norms and rules was stressed by students in their interviews. It did not appear to matter that the norms and rules were rigid and strict. It did matter that the teacher insisted that students follow them. Further, based on observation narratives, the extent to which the teacher made the rules and norms clear to the students seemed to be important. Likewise, sanctioning of only the student (or students)

who failed to follow one or more rules or norms was more successful than group discipline.

As might be expected, the teachers differed in terms of the types of rules they established and the ways they sanctioned students. Teachers AB, AG, AI, and AJ established rules and norms that allowed little student interaction or movement about the classroom. In addition, Teacher AB used "plans" in which a student who had failed to follow a rule or norm described the rule or norm that was "broken" and listed how he or she would behave in the future in order to conform to it. A "plan" was taken home and signed by the student's parents. Teacher AI sent a student to the principal's office if he or she misbehaved more than three times during a class period. Teachers AG and AJ were recognized by the students as persons who enforced the many rules and norms that were established. Students commented in their interviews about the large number of digressions Teacher AG observed. Student A23 commented that Teacher AJ "don't mess around."

Teachers AA, AC, AF, AH, and AK established rules and norms that allowed the students somewhat more flexibility than the teachers listed above. Students in Teacher AA's classes indicated that they obeyed him because they liked him. They noted that he operationalized threats, such as sending students out of the room or keeping them after school for "fooling around and talking." Student A15 commented on Teacher AA's approach to discipline:

> He does things fair. If your pencil needs sharpening, he lets you go sharpen it. If you need paper, he lets you have some paper. He doesn't yell at you unless you are absolutely doing something that is disturbing the class.

Teacher AC stressed development of behaviors that would make each of the students "a responsible student and a responsible human being in [the] classroom." He reprimanded students for disturbing others and sent a report to the parents when a student peristently refused to follow a rule or norm and disrupted others' work.

Teacher AF allowed more latitude than most other teachers observed at Waverley. For example, on the first day he informed the students:

> In the art room there is more mobility than in other rooms. We move around the room. If you want to get a pencil, get a pencil. You go to the locker. You wash your hands . . . talking is okay when you are working. If I find you talking about last night's date and no work getting done, then I shall be unhappy.

Teacher AF also told his students he expected them to be silent when he was talking, to follow his directions, and to speak courteously to him. When interacting with each other, he told them to eschew

hazing, teasing, and other forms of bad manners, and that he expected them to have "a positive, friendly, and helpful attitude toward each other." Teacher AF most often reprimanded students for talking, off-task behavior, and procedures violations. However, after the first week of school, few procedures violations were observed.

Teacher AH handled discipline in a formal, somewhat impersonal manner. Often, he directed the student who was misbehaving to a correct form of behavior rather than noting the rule infraction. For example, when Student A8 was observed talking to other students about bicycles and racing cars, Teacher AH asked if his vocabulary, crossword puzzles, and extra credit asignments were finished. When Student A8 replied, "No," Teacher AH told him to get the work done. Other times, Teacher AH explained why a student should not do something, as illustrated in this excerpt from the observation narratives:

> Teacher AH says, "Please don't lean" (referring to a student who is leaning back in his chair) "or you'll end up with a cast on your other hand."

Teacher AE's system of rules and norms and her mode of sanctioning students appeared to differ from both the rigid systems established by Teachers AB, AG, AI, and AJ and the more flexible, concern-for-others systems used by Teachers AA, AC, and AF, in particular, and Teacher AH, somewhat. While Teacher AE was observed sanctioning students for failing to follow a specific rule, her tone of voice was not viewed by the students as "real punishment." For example, Student A17 stated, "Teacher AE doesn't stand on you or watch you like a hawk or anything. She talks real quiet. Most everybody in my class is okay." Student A16 said, "I've never seen anybody get in trouble in that [Teacher AE's] class." The observation narratives include examples of behavior control. Many contained statements by Teacher AE indicating the student's behavior was disrupting the class. However, most students perceived these to be "warnings" rather than "punishments." As a result, it is not clear whether Teacher AE established and expected students to conform to a set of rules and norms or used a more open-ended approach to classroom behavior. In any event, Student A21 said the class had four standards: "Complete the work, do it neat, do it right, listen."

Teacher AD is the only teacher who was observed to have little, or no, control over student behavior in the classroom. The observation narratives include example after example of purposeful student misbehavior, followed by nondirective teacher sanctions such as "Don't forget, we raise our hands when we want to talk" or "I wonder if we're going to have to send someone out." Such statements seldom eliminated the chaos. In addition, Student A28 commented about the amount of misbehavior Teacher AD ignored. Student A14 pointed out how the students planned the ways they would misbehave. The observer noted how seldom Teacher AD operationalized his threats to punish "the class." Perhaps partly due to his failure to establish and maintain a system of rules and norms that facilitated supportive interactions in his classroom, students appeared to be much less cooperative and much more confrontational in Teacher AD's classes than in their other classes.

Summary

The instructional features that differentiated among the learning experiences of the seventh-grade students within similar activity structures centered around (1) the degree to which the teacher was available to assist individual students, (2) the extent to which teacher instructions and explanations were clear and understandable to the students, (3) the amount of attention given to maintenance of students' interest as well as content coverage, and (4) the extent to which teacher management of students' classroom behavior was consistent, fair, and maintained an orderly work environment.

Relative to these features, it is interesting to note that, although the students came from sixth-grade classrooms where the activity structures were more complex and more varied than those experienced in seventh grade, the features that differentiated among the seventh-grade classes were ones that did not require modification in the activity structures. Based on the sixth-grade structures, features such as teacher encouragement of student control over various aspects of the assigned work, or provision of opportunities to work cooperatively with other students might have been expected to be important. No reference to such instructional features occurred in the observations or interviews. Apparently, the students had accepted the restricted structures at Waverley by the time the October and November interviews were conducted, or they were less concerned about the loss of these structural elements than the manner in which the four features listed above impacted their daily schooling experiences. Regardless, the presence of the four instructional features provided students with a learning experience that differed markedly from that which occurred in classes where the features were missing.

Relationship of Organization of Instruction and Students' Successful Transition to Junior High School

Volume IV of this report presents detailed information regarding 24 target-students' transitions to junior high school. As part of the data analysis and reporting relative to students' transition experiences, a judgment was made as to the success of each target-student's transition in each classroom in which he or she was observed. Four criteria were applied by two independent raters to derive a successful/unsuccessful transition rating. The first criterion was the grade assigned to a student by the teacher at the time of the first-quarter report card (end of first nine weeks of the school year), with a "C-" or better as the minimum grade for a moderately successful rating on these criteria. The second criterion was the student's academic behavior in the classroom, including amount of time engaged in academic vs. nonacademic work, correctness of oral responses to teacher questions during recitations, or lack of such responses, and completion of assigned work. The third criterion included a general assessment of the appropriateness of the student's classroom behavior, given the rules and norms operable in the classroom. The fourth criterion

looked at the student's social relationships with his or her peers, at a minimum requiring the relationships to be nonhostile. Using these criteria, each rater assigned each of 24 target students an over-all successful, moderately successful, or unsuccessful transition rating for each classroom in which the student was observed. The ratings then were compared. In those few instances where the raters disagreed, a third party was asked to read the student's case description and make a rating. The majority rating prevailed.

Prior to discussing the relationship of organization of instruction and the success of students' transitions, several caveats must be presented. The student sample from which the data are drawn was small; 24 target students with only six students coming from each of the four elementary schools in which organizational structures were studied. Further, because each student was observed in more than one seventh-grade class, the same students may contribute to the percentages reported for several seventh-grade teachers. While some students were successful in one seventh-grade class and not another, the repetition of students across classes nonetheless confounds the data. In addition, the number of target students observed varied across seventh-grade classrooms. Hence the number of students from which the percentage scores are derived varies across cells in the tables that follow.

The discussion that follows considers the relationship between two aspects of the sixth-grade classrooms and students' general success in transition to junior high school. These are (1) whether the structures required students to work with several teachers or utilized self-contained classrooms and (2) the diversity in activity structures that was experienced across a given school day. At the seventh-grade level the relationship of students' transition success with the four within-activity-structure instructional features is considered. Since the seventh-grade activity structures were more similar than different across the teachers, comparison based on the structural elements themselves do not appear to be warranted. For purposes of this discussion, only students' general transition ratings are utilized. Volume IV provides detailed information regarding students' success, based on the four specific transition measures mentioned above as well as the general, overall rating.

Seventh-Grade Structural Elements

As noted above, two ways in which the sixth-grade classes differed markedly were the requirement that students work with multiple teachers versus assignment to a self-contained classroom and the diversity in activity structures that occurred across a school day.

Students assigned to Teachers 302, 303, 304, and 305 and to Teachers 701, 702, and 703 for sixth grade were in cluster programs in which different teachers taught different subjects. Both the sixth-grade teachers and the target students in these classes commented that they thought this experience would prepare students for the departmentalized seventh-grade program.

Teachers 301, 401, 402, 601, 602, and 603 taught self-contained classrooms. Students in these classes worked with other teachers only on rare occasions when some joint classroom activities might be conducted.

Table 2.7 reports the percent of students who came from these two sets of classes who made successful, moderately successful, or unsuccessful transitions to junior high school.

Table 2.7

Success of Target Student Transition to Seventh Grade Based on Sixth-grade Self-contained or Diversified Classroom Setting

CLASSROOM SETTING	PERCENT TARGET STUDENTS' TRANSITION		
	Successful	Moderately Successful	Unsuccessful
Self-contained	.66*	.33	.00
Diversified	.42	.33	.25

* Percent rounded to nearest hundredth.

Interestingly, the students from the self-contained classes appear to have been more successful than those from the diversified classes. All the students who were from self-contained sixth-grade classes made successful or moderately successful transitions, while approximately 25 percent of the students from the sixth-grade settings where students moved from teacher to teacher failed to make successful transitions by the end of the first quarter of the school year. In interpreting these findings, it should be noted that the findings may be confounded by the 90-student instructional system utilized in the JM Keynes cluster (Teachers 701, 702, and 703) during the last three and a half months of sixth grade. However, data for only those students in the CH Dana cluster follow a similar pattern with 25 percent making successful transitions; 50 percent moderately successful; and 25 percent, unsuccessful. Thus, for these sixth grades, students from the self-contained settings appear to have moved to, and functioned in, the junior high school setting more successfully than those from the diversified teacher settings. This finding is contrary to data reported in other studies of junior high school. The discrepancy will be considered later in the discussion of the relationship of this study to adolescent schooling.

The extent to which students were required to adapt to, and perform successfully in, different types of activity structures across the subject areas in the sixth-grade is another dimension on which the classrooms differed. Here, students' experiences in the self-contained as well as the cluster classes were considered. Four self-contained classrooms (Teachers 301, 402, 601, and 603) utilized activity structures that differed across the subject areas. The CH Dana cluster, which included Teachers 302, 303, 304, and 305, also presented different activity structures across the teachers who taught the various subjects. The other classes, including the JM Keynes cluster, had structures where organization for instruction in the various subject areas was more similar than different. Table 2.8 reports data regarding the transition success of target students who came from these sixth-grade classes.

Table 2.8

Success of Target Student Transition to Seventh Grade Based on Structural Diversity in Organization for Instruction Across Sixth-Grade Classrooms

ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION	PERCENT TARGET STUDENTS' TRANSITION		
	Successful	Moderately Successful	Unsuccessful
Structural Diversity	.73*	.18	.09
Similar Structures	.38	.46	.15

* Percent rounded to nearest hundredth.

Perusal of Table 2.8 suggests that target students from the sixth-grade classes with structural diversity across subjects were more successful in their transition to junior high school than those from other classes. Apparently students who learned to adapt to different structures (rather than different teacher personalities) in sixth-grade were better prepared to perform successfully in the departmentalized, six-period, seventh-grade program. This suggests that development of students' skills in decoding, understanding, and responding to the demands placed upon them by different configurations of activity structure elements may be a more important elementary school experience than merely moving from one teacher to another. When similar activity structures were used by either one or a cluster of teachers for work in a large portion of the sixth-grade subjects, the data suggest that the students

in their classes had problems with the transition. Even though the seventh-grade teachers employed similar activity structures, previous experience with diverse structures in elementary school seemed to enhance students' capacity to move into the junior high school program successfully.

Seventh-Grade Within-Activity-Structure Features

Earlier, we discussed the four within-activity-structure features that differentiated the learning experiences of a seventh-grade student in one classroom compared with another. These were teacher accessibility, clarity of the teacher's explanations and directions, the extent to which the teacher was concerned about students' interests as well as content coverage, and the teacher's establishment and enforcement of classroom rules and norms.

Inasmuch as the seventh-grade teachers differed in regard to the presence or absence in their classes of one or more of these features, multiple groupings of the teachers are possible for the purpose of investigating students' transition success. Rather than compile separate tables summarizing data for the different configurations of teachers based on the presence of each feature, Table 2.9 presents the percent of those who were observed in the classes taught by a specific teacher whose transitions were rated as successful, moderately successful, or unsuccessful. The discussion that follows extracts data from this table as appropriate, given each teacher's use of a particular feature.

Only one teacher, Teacher AD, was observed and reported as evidencing none of the within-activity-structure instructional features. Based on this finding, it is interesting to note that 45 percent of the target students who were enrolled in one of his classes were rated as making successful transitions to junior high school. This was the lowest success rate reported for any seventh-grade teacher.

In contrast, Teacher AA was reported to have all the within-structure features. Fifty-six percent of the target students enrolled in his classes were rated as making successful transitions. Although this was not the highest percent of students making successful transitions across all the teachers, it was higher than the percent reported for Teacher AD.

Looking across the seven teachers who had 56 percent or more of the target students enrolled in their classes make successful transitions, five of them were described as being accessible to their students (Teachers AA, AB, AE, AG, and AJ). This feature was not mentioned in the observation and interview data for the other two teachers (Teachers AC and AK). Likewise, five teachers (Teachers AA, AC, AE, AJ, and AK) were reported to be concerned about students' interest in what was taught. In addition, for the other two teachers (AB and AG) the observations suggest that they may have made some limited efforts to generate students' interest, although they did not attend to this feature as much as the other five. Establishment and enforcement of rules and norms was another feature that most of these teachers

Table 2.9

Percent of Target Students Who Were Rated Successful, Moderately Successful, or Unsuccessful in Specific Seventh-Grade Teachers' Classes

SEVENTH-GRADE TEACHER	TARGET STUDENT TRANSITION RATING		
	Successful	Moderately Successful	Unsuccessful
AA	.56*	.27	.18
AB	.56	.09	.36
AC	.66	.33	.01
AD	.45	.09	.45
AE	.62	.13	.25
AF	.50	.50	.00
AG	.60	.00	.40
AH	.50	.00	.50
AI	.50	.00	.50
AJ	.58	.00	.42
AK	1.00	.00	.00

* Percent of target students enrolled in teacher's classes rounded to nearest hundredth.

were observed to do. Six teachers did so. Information is not clear about whether Teacher AE set up a system of rules and norms that was understood by the students. The observations show her sanctioning students' social behavior, but do not report information about the system upon which the sanctions were based. Because specific information regarding teacher clarity was limited in the case descriptions, little information was provided about this feature for most of the teachers in this group. Teacher AB was shown to be unclear. Teachers AA and AG had references made to their clarity.

Based on the above distribution of the within-structure features across the teachers who had more than half the students enrolled in their classes make successful transitions, the two features that appear to be most important are teacher accessibility and establishment of a system of rules and norms that maintained a classrom environment in which the teacher and students could function productively. Enforcement of these rules and norms through individual rather than group-focused sanctions also is important. Clarity and attention to students' interests seem to be less important in that they were reported for fewer of these teachers than the other two features.

From the opposite perspective, three teachers (Teachers AD, AH, and AI) had 45 percent or more of the target students enrolled in their classes who, at the end of the first quarter of the year, were unsuccessful in their transition to junior high school. Two features that were omitted in all these classes were teacher accessibility and attention to students' interests. Thus accessibility, again, seems to be related to students' success in transition. Furthermore, attention to students' interests also may be important, at least as a means for preventing nonattention to assigned tasks.

Hence teacher accessibility definitely appears to be related to students' success in transition from elementary to junior high school. The extent to which the teacher establishes and individually enforces a system of classroom rules and norms and the teacher's attention to development of students' interest in the work to be done also seem to have some relationship to students' transition success. However, these features do not stand out as markedly as teacher accessibility. Because the data reported in the seventh-grade teacher case descriptions regarding teacher clarity were scarce, it is not possible to determine the relative importance of this feature.

Conclusion and Relation to Literature on Early Adolescent Schooling

The above synthesis of findings regarding organization of instruction in the sixth-grade clases in the Waverley Junior High School attendance area and in the seventh-grade classes at Waverley suggests that the structures of the sixth-grade classrooms were more diversified, required the students to respond to a wider range of instructional demands, and placed greater responsibility on the students for

designing and carrying out their learning activities than the seventhgrade structures. At the seventh-grade level, the activity structures utilized by the teachers were more alike than different. Nonetheless, students had markedly different learning experiences in some classes compared with others. Analysis of teacher and student behavior and interactions in the seventh-grade classes pointed out four instructional features that differed across the teachers. These were (1) accessibility of the teacher; (2) clarity of teacher explanations, instruction, and directions; (3) the extent to which the teacher was concerned about students' interest in the assigned work as well as content coverage; and (4) whether and how the teacher established and enforced a system of classroom rules and norms that facilitated productive student participation.

Using each of 24 target students' ratings of general success in making a productive transition to junior high school as an outcome measure, sixth-grade experience with diverse activity structures across the subject matter areas appeared to promote success in students' transitions to junior high school. Placement in a sixth-grade arrangement that required working with different teachers, but not necessarily different activity structures, did not seem to promote success in transition.

At the seventh-grade level, failure on the part of a teacher to utilize the four within-activity structure instructional features (i.e., Teacher AD) appeared to be related to a high proportion of the students making an unsuccessful transition in that class. Among the four within-structure features, teacher accessibility was found to have the most obvious relationship with successful student transition. Establishing and enforcing rules and norms and attention to students' interest appeared to have a less marked but some relationship with transition success. Data regarding teacher clarity were limited, thus making it difficult to draw conclusions regarding this feature.

The within-activity structure features identified in this transition study overlap with the active or direct teaching behaviors that have been found to be most effective based on a wide variety of process-product studies of teaching at the elementary level. As summarized by Good (1979), based on a compilation prepared by Rosenshine (1980), these are:

1. Teacher places a clear focus on academic goals.

2. Teacher makes an effort to promote extensive content coverage and high levels of student involvement in classroom tasks.

3. Teacher selects instructional goals and actively monitors student progress toward those goals.

4. Teacher structures learning activities and feedback is immediate and academically oriented.

5. Teacher creates an environment that is task-oriented but relaxed.

(Good, 1979, p. 55)

Metz (1978) reported other work that focused on teacher characteristics that are similar to the stress on content coverage evidenced by some transition study seventh-grade teachers and the attention to students' interests as well as content coverage observed in other teachers' classes. Metz identified two types of teachers in her study of junior high school settings. One group stressed curriculum only and were labeled "incorporative" teachers. The other was concerned with whether students were mastering and were interested in the content, along with other student needs. These teachers were termed "developmental" teachers. None of Metz's teachers withdrew from performance of instructional responsibilities to the extent that Teacher AD did in the study reported here.

While Metz stated that it was not the purpose of her work to judge the merits of the two approaches, she indicated that both students learning experiences and the final content of what was learned would differ in the two types of classes. The transition study descriptive data support this conclusion.

Yet another aspect of teaching research applies to the findings reported here. As noted by Doyle (1979) and Evertson (1980), at the secondary level, teacher behavior may be shaped more by the demands of the activity structure than the needs of the students. Several of the transition study seventh-grade teachers evidenced this characteristic. For example, Teacher AH, who taught an elective reading course largely chosen by lower ability students and had 50 percent of the target students in his classes rated as unsuccessful in their transitions, relied on small-group instruction with the students involved in silent reading, commercially prepared seatwork, and/or listening activities recorded on cassette tapes. While his instructions were clear and his discipline standards consistently enforced, Teacher AH's knowledge of students' academic needs seemed slight. The students were involved almost entirely with mechanical, self-correcting materials. There was little exchange of information about learning between student and teacher. Students tended to feel the course was too "easy," yet, given the few academic exchanges that took place, Teacher AH had no way of finding this out. Thus Teacher AH's structure, as well as his within-structure lack of accessibility, allowed him to limit his contact with, and knowledge of, students' needs. This apparently had a negative influence on the success of students' transitions to this junior high school class.

In another way, all the seventh-grade teachers except Teacher AC were victims of their own structures, or, in this instance, the repetition of the structures that occurred across the six periods each day. Teaching the same lesson in the same way and within the same structure four or five times a day was tiring -- even boring. Several teachers commented on this.

From another viewpoint, the work of researchers such as Doyle (1979) and Metz (1978) suggests that mastery of the curriculum is not an aim of many students. As Doyle pointed out, students, particularly junior high and high school students, are adept at reducing the risk and ambiguity of classroom work. Further, as Becker, Geer, and Hughes (1968) noted, learning tasks are embedded in an exchange of performance for grades. Students are required to complete assignments, take tests, etc., in order to obtain grades. Clearly students in Teacher AD's and Teacher AB's classes attempted to reduce the ambiguity and risk of their work. In addition, Teacher AD's behavior demonstrated that he was not in the least interested in maintaining his part of "the exchange of performance for grades." Further, while grades were important in all the teachers' classrooms, the unspoken assumptions about proper student behavior while in search of these grades differed. For example, the emphasis on procedures in Teacher AB's class, the use of commercial and mechanical seatwork, and the lack of teacher contact in Teacher AH's class, and the motivational atmosphere in Teacher AA's class each required students to utilize skills other than strictly academic skills to obtain grades. The interaction skills and other social understandings and skills required to participate successfully in each class differed noticeably.

These thoughts suggest a thrust of the study findings that may be particularly noteworthy. Activity structures, the within-activity structure instructional features, and the students' own "hidden curricula" seem to create an environment to which both teachers and students must react. (The students' place in this equation is discussed in Volume IV.) The reactions are not always conducive to a stable classroom environment and to learning academic material. Thus further pursuit of the features that enhance learning appears to be warranted.

Another strand of research that is related to this transition study is the impact of students' experiences in the last year of elementary school on their transitions to junior high school. As discussed earlier, the elementary classrooms that fed Waverley Junior High School had more varied and complex activity structures than the seventh-grade classrooms. This finding appeared both across schools and throughout the individual students' days. In sixth grade, students had more choices, more varied grouping experiences, and were required to cooperate with each other to produce products. Teachers at Waverley did not expand or extend these curricular experiences. Instead, in seventh grade, instruction generally retracted into similar structures incorporating recitation and seatwork with few choices, no cooperative work, and few small-group arrangements. Given this elementary-junior high school disparity, the elementary school variable that proved to be most important for successful transition was students' experiences in a program that used diverse activity structures throughout a school day. Cluster versus self-contained classroom experience was less important.

Contrary to these findings, McPartland, Epstein, and McDill (1972) found that students from open settings did better in junior high school than students from self-contained settings. In addition, "open" elementary schools were found to be closer to junior high schools than "self-contained" elementary schools, in terms of students' interaction with

multiple teachers and provision of more activities and more electives. In contrast, in the present study, diversity in the structures and activities experienced by students was not contingent upon their being in an "open" setting as defined by McPartland, et al. Nonetheless, structural diversity was found to be relevant to students' success in transition in both studies.

Several activity structure elements that were missing at the seventh-grade level in the present transition study are of as much interest as those that were present. For example, cooperation among students, e.g., that required by certain forms of division of labor, has been studied by Slavin (1980), Gump (1980), and Johnson and Johnson (1974). All have noted increased student motivation, increased altruism, and more positive attitudes toward learning in students who engaged in cooperative group work. Slavin also found that, for preadolescents, math and language arts achievement increased and was distributed more widely among group members in cooperative group-learning settings. The omission of such elements in the activity structures at Waverley may be a matter of concern.

Throughout this discussion, various aspects of teacher authority have been suggested by the organization of instruction findings that were reported. Spady (1974) listed three types of authority that teachers of adolescent youth might employ. One was charismatic authority, which was based on the ability of the possessor to "deliver the goods." This, in turn, implied a continuing ability to understand and respond to the needs of those to be led or controlled. A second was traditional authority. This was unquestioned authority such as that employed by monarchies. As Spady stated, "Arrangements are treated as givens and are honored on the basis of their having endured for generations" (p. 47). A third was rational-legal authority. Spadey broke this into authority based on laws and authority based on expertise. In the latter case, he noted that the demonstrated competence and the technical resources of the individual warranted the authority status.

Spady argued American schools have lost the ability to demand allegiance and exercise authority based on traditional or legal grounds. Therefore, the teacher must use a combination of charismatic and expert authority. He stated, "Perhaps the most important component of the teacher's repertoire of abilities is the capacity to establish rapport with students by caring about them as individuals in order to aid them in developing a sense of security and confidence" (p. 59). Spady continued by pointing out four characteristics of a teacher that facilitate successful exercising of authority, all of which resemble findings reported here. These include: (a) has something of substance and interest to say, (b) is capable of saying it clearly and accurately, (c) is capable of saying it in a stimulating and exciting fashion, and (d) can base this communication directly on a concern for the personal welfare of each student (p. 60).

The data obtained at Waverley support Spady's contentions. Only Teacher AA displayed all the authority legitimization characteristics mentioned by Spady. However, the other teachers who also had

56 percent or more of their students make successful transitions in their classes utilized authority based largely on expertise, but also on responsiveness to, and, perhaps some concern for, individuals. Teacher AD clearly attempted to apply traditional authority with no success.

This summary of findings and the syntheses presented earlier in this chapter have provided an overview of the major findings regarding organization of instruction in elementary and junior high school classrooms. Several instructional features have been identified that facilitate students' successful transition to junior high school. More detailed information regarding the sixth- and seventh-grade classes that were observed in the transition study follows in Chapters Three and Four. The study sample and the data collection methods utilized to obtain the instructional organization data are presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER THREE

ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN SIXTH-GRADE CLASSROOMS

As noted earlier, students came to Waverley Junior High School from six different elementary schools located in two school districts. In order to obtain information about the ways in which the sixth grades in these schools were organized, descriptive observations were conducted in the spring in 13 sixth-grade classrooms. These classrooms were located in four of the six schools. In the other two schools, the teachers opted not to participate because only one teacher taught sixth grade, and data regarding the two classes could be aligned too readily with the specific teacher. Curriculum interviews with the 13 teachers who participated also provided information about the classes. (See Chapter Five of this volume and Volume I of the study report for further information about data collection methodology.)

An instructional organization construct known as "activity structure" was used to describe and compare the 13 sixth-grade classes. This concept was defined and discussed in Chapter One. Briefly, in review, six elements of instructional organization come together to create an activity structure. Each element, as well as the structure itself, places demands on the student, particularly in regard to how he or she must participate in classroom activities if he or she is to perform successfully. The activity structure elements are: (1) content of the work, (2) work group size and composition, (3) division of labor, (4) student control over various aspects of the work, (5) mode of teacher evaluation, and (6) restrictions on student advancement. The descriptions that follow include activity structure data for the sixth-grade classrooms that were observed. The findings are reported by teacher within each school.

CH Dana Elementary School

Sixth-grade students at CH Dana Elementary School were placed in one of two organizational arrangements. Some students were assigned to a self-contained classroom taught by Teacher 301. The remaining sixth-grade students were assigned to a cluster in which four teachers taught fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students in multigrade groupings. The ways in which instruction was organized in these two settings are described below.

Teacher 301

Teacher 301 had a self-contained sixth-grade class. He was responsible for instruction in all the academic subjects. As Table 3.1 shows, he used whole-group instruction, small-group instruction, and individualized work. Whole group instruction occurred in Reading, Science, and Social Studies. Small groups were used in PE, Art, and occasionally in Language. At times, they also were used in Reading. The small groups were based on ability in Reading and Language and on interest in Art and PE. Individualized instruction was the dominant form of instruction in Math and Language.

No division of labor was observed in the class or mentioned by the teacher in his curriculum interview. Students worked alone on their own assignments. Some student control was evident in most subjects. Teacher 301 reported that he often allowed his students control over which of several assignments to complete. Student control over pacing occurred only in Math. Teacher 301 kept control over pacing in all other subjects, requiring the students to check their work with him at frequent intervals.

In his interview, Teacher 301 reported that he evaluated students' academic progress both publicly and privately.

Thus, by the end of sixth grade, the students in Teacher 301's classroom had had experience with organizational structures that included large group, small group, and individualized grouping practices. They had had some control over the activity to be completed (based on selection of the activity from among several specified by the teacher) and the amount of time spent on a particular activity. They had had little experience with activities that required them to work collaboratively or cooperatively with other students. They were accustomed to having the teacher tell them when they could advance to a new assignment and to having the teacher evaluate their work in public, so the entire class knew how well they did on an assignment.

In his informal observations of the teacher's classroom, the observer commented that the atmosphere appeared to be "boring and oppressive" and that the students seemed to be "given no academic work that was even minimally challenging." Hence, the students most likely were accustomed to carrying out simple instructional activities.

CH Dana Cluster: Teachers 302, 303, 304, and 305

Teachers 302, 303, 304, and 305 also were observed at CH Dana Elementary School. They worked in a section of the school that included a central area with four open-space classrooms clustered around it. Since much of the instruction was planned at a "cluster" level, the organization of the cluster is discussed first. Then the activity structures of each participating teacher are described.

Each teacher had a homeroom that contained fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders and was responsible for teaching one subject. Classes

Table 3.1

Teacher 301's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENT					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math	- Individual - 1:1 assistance from teacher - Whole group for lecture (every two weeks) + grocery store math (Thurs.)	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity or worksheets - Pacing within the day	- Academic - individual public, e.g., answer to problems read aloud - Academic - individual private, +/- eval. on corrected papers - Academic - class, public evaluation - Behavior - individual public and private	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Reading	- Whole group - 2 small groups based on ability	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity	- Academic - class, public evaluation, occasionally private - Academic - individual public evaluation	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Health and Science	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity: verbal performance, sharing experiences	- Academic - class, public - Behavior - individual public - Behavior - class public - Academic - individual private and public (students have access to grade book) - Character - individual public	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Language	- Individual - Occasionally small group	- No division of labor	- Selection of activities: short stories, book reports for extra credit	- Academic - class and individual public - Behavior - individual negative evaluation private	- Dependent on teacher to begin next day's work
Social Studies	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - class public - Behavior - class informal evaluation - Academic - individual private written comments on tests and assignments	- High dependence on teacher to advance
PE	- Various small groups	- No division of labor	- Selection of of activity: team sports or free play	- No evaluation	- None
Art	- Small groups	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity	- Not discussed	- Not discussed

had mixed grades throughout the day. Each class began the day with the homeroom teacher and then rotated as a group through the other classes for instruction in the remaining subjects.

A typical day consisted of five periods. First period was homeroom (which included academic work); second, third, and fourth periods were in other classes. Students spent 45 minutes per period. Each period covered one of the following subject areas: Reading, Math, Language Arts, or Social Studies. After lunch, students returned to their homerooms for fifth period, which was referred to as study hall. During fifth period, students were to continue work on their various assignments from the day. Any unfinished work was to be taken home and completed. Afternoon activities included PE and filmstrips. Viewing of the filmstrips was set up in the center of the cluster and was available to all interested students.

Each classroom was decorated and supplied with materials relevant to the particular teacher's subject area. Activity centers were set up about each classroom. For example, Teacher 303 had two centers of science, two centers of social studies, and one of art activities. During each period, small groups of six to seven students would spend the time at one center. Students would rotate through all the centers in a classroom over a given week. The students did not have their own desks. They worked around large tables or at the various centers. Books and personal belongings were kept in their "cubbies."

Within this scheduling arrangement, there was little differentiation of work among the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders. The only distinguishing factor appeared to be the quantity of work assigned. As far as the observer could tell, sixth-graders were expected to do longer assignments, but the topics were the same.

One problem related to the arrangement of the cluster, which was expressed by several teachers, was the necessity of keeping track of more than 120 students. However, each September, teachers actually only needed to become familiar with the fourth-grade students, since they already knew the fifth- and sixth-grade students from the previous year.

Teacher 303 also felt that a feeling of "togetherness," i.e., cohesiveness, was lacking among the four teachers. Meetings among them were infrequent because they were more interested in "doing their own thing." The observer noted, however, that, by and large, assignments and daily routines were coordinated among the classes. For example, on the observation day, swimming lessons for all fourth-graders and a pending field trip to the Gold Country for the entire cluster were discussed and organized by all the teachers.

In conclusion, this cluster presented students with several experiences that were similar to those they would face in junior high school. Specifically, it accustomed students to dealing with several teachers, changing classrooms, and having distinct subject matter periods. More detailed information follows regarding the activity structures used within each classroom.

Teacher 302. Teacher 302 taught Language Arts, including Creative Writing, Spelling, and Grammar. The elements of the activity structures used for these subparts of the program are presented in Table 3.2 (see next page).

Teacher 302 used whole group instruction. Except for occasional partner work in Spelling, students worked on their own assignments, which usually were the same for all grade levels. The only student control mentioned in the teacher interview or observed in the classroom was students' control over the topic of their creative writing assignments. Student advancement was controlled by the teacher. Academic evaluation appeared to be private, although Teacher 302 made general remarks to the class evaluating the whole group's academic performance.

Teacher 303. As a member of the CH Dana cluster, Teacher 303 taught Science, Social Studies, Art, and Drama. The activity structures for these subjects are described in Table 3.3 (see next page).

Teacher 303 used both whole-class groups and small groups during instruction. Whole groups occurred in Art and Social Studies; small groups in Science, Social Studies, and Drama. In Social Studies the groups were based on ability. Various forms of division of labor were employed. In Art the students worked separately on their own projects. In Science -- and less often in Social Studies -- students worked as "teams" on a project, each student producing his his or her own product, but being dependent on the other members of the team for help. Science projects had a heavy emphasis on experimentation. For example, a project on electricity required the students to use batteries, wires, bulbs, switches, and so on, to create an electrical circuit. In Social Studies, group work sometimes required students to work together to produce a single product, such as a model of a Gold Rush town.

In the academic areas of Social Studies and Science, Teacher 303 extended little student control over content, form, or time. However, when he assigned projects such as those described above, he granted the students control over the procedures they would follow. In Art and Drama the students had some control over content and form. Student advancement was limited by the teacher. In all subject areas, he checked student progress during the activities. In activities involving group collaboration, student advancement was further limited by the participation and needs of the other members of the group. Data on Teacher 303's evaluation of students were limited but suggested that a pattern of public evaluation of behavior and private or semi-private evaluation of academic performance was the norm in this class.

Teacher 304. Teacher 304 was responsible for Reading and the associated skills of Vocabulary and Phonics for the students in the cluster. Except for Silent Reading, Teacher 304 used small groups based on ability that rotated through the activities noted on Table 3.4 (see page 69). Students worked alone on assignments, which were identical for each member of a group. No division of labor was reported. However, the teacher extended to the students considerable

Table 3.2

Teacher 302's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENT					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Creative Writing	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity: content of papers	- Academic - private, grade and notes written on assign. as well as suggestions for improvement - Criteria not comparable	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Spelling	- Whole group	- No explicit role differentiation, e.g., pairs of students dictate words to each other	- No student control	- Academic - private; scores on test and corrections and comments on written work	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Grammar	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - written eval. based on neatness, quality, and effort	- Dependent on teacher for assignment

Table 3.3

Teacher 303's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Science	- Small groups, less than six students	- Group work which doesn't require explicit role differentiation - Individual, e.g., charts	- No student control	- Behavior - indiv. public - Behavior - group public - Academic - indiv. private - Academic-gp. pub.	- Dependent on peers, materials to complete task - Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Social Studies	- Whole group - Occasionally small groups by ability	- No division of labor - Explicit role differentiation not required in small groups	- Order in which individual assignments are completed	- Not discussed	- Dependent on peers to share book - Dependent on teacher to advance within an activity
Drama	- Small groups	- Explicit role differentiation required in group activity, e.g., each contributed to production of the props for group's play	- Selection of activity; i.e., they were to do a play but could act it out, do a puppet show, a radio show, etc.	- Not discussed	- May advance within an activity without teacher's approval - Some dependence on peers to complete dramatic productions
Art	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- One out of three times students controlled what to create	- Public eval. on individual task accomplishment	- Dependent on teacher to advance within an activity

Table 3.4

Teacher 304's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENT					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Silent Reading	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity: library book for book report or work on GINN series (reading program)	- Behavior - public	- May advance within activity without teacher's approval
Reading	- Grouped according to ability (six students at each center)	- No division of labor	- Which reading kit used - Pacing within the week - Selection of activity for book reports	- Academic - individual public evaluation	- Independent over 5-6 weeks at which time they take a test, teacher okay's continuation to next unit
Listening Vocabulary	- Small groups (six students)	- No division of labor	- None, must listen to tape and watch film or read corresponding book, then do worksheets	- Academic - group private evaluation - Self-correcting - Behavior - individual public	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Reading Comprehensions	- Small groups (six students)	- No division of labor	- Pacing over six weeks - Control of order in which they read within the level	- Self-correcting - Academic - Teacher checks students progress quarterly	- Teacher's approval not needed to advance
Phonics	- Small groups (six students)	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Self-correcting	- Advance with teacher's approval

control over their work, allowing choice of reading matter in Silent Reading, and, perhaps most notably, long-range control over the pacing of their decoding and comprehension assignments. As the activity structure description in the table notes, students' progress in the reading comprehension and decoding aspects of the curriculum were formally checked by the teacher only once over a five- or six-week period. However, some day-to-day boundaries appear to have existed within this larger time frame, since a typical day's assignment, as described by Teacher 304, consisted of reading a short story from a basic text and answering the publisher's prepared exercises. Academic evaluation in this class included a combination of public and private comments by the teacher and self-checking by the students.

Teacher 305. Teacher 305 taught Math to the students in the cluster. As indicated in Table 3.5, students were grouped into five small groups based on ability. At the beginning of the week, they received assignment packets that were due on Friday. Generally, the teacher approved advancement to the next packet only after checking the completed packets to be sure students had mastered the skills covered in the previous week's work. Sometimes the students could select the packet in which they would work for the week. Teacher 305's evaluation of students' academic performance was based on a combination of public and private comments.

Table 3.5

Teacher 305's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math	- Individual or small groups based on ability	- No division of labor	- Some selection of materials - Pacing within the week for packets	- Academic - public to whole group and individual	- Dependent on teacher to move to next level of text, or take test

Cluster Summary. The CH Dana cluster exposed students to the activity structures of four teachers. Grouping practices clearly favored small groups, but whole-group and individual instruction also existed. Division of labor occasionally called for groups working together on projects, but typically students worked independently. Generally, students had some control over the pacing of their work, being allowed to work on the same assignment for several days, or, in the reading class, several weeks. Consequently, the teachers often allowed the students to proceed for a period of time longer than one day before checking their progress. Evaluation reflected the style

of the different teachers, which consisted of both private and public comments regarding students' academic achievement.

Based on comments made in their interviews, the cluster teachers felt their ways of organizing instruction prepared the students for junior high school. Insofar as the cluster presented the students with the experience of learning different subjects from different teachers, this may be true. Indeed, students from this cluster commented during their junior high interviews on the similarity of junior high and elementary school in this regard.

However, in terms of the other activity structure elements -- particularly group size, division of labor, student control, and student advancement -- this elementary school program included much more diversity across subject areas and teachers than was found at the junior high school. The students in this cluster, therefore, had been required to understand, accommodate to, and participate in a more complex and varied instructional program at the elementary level than was presented at junior high school, where structures were repetitive across periods, teachers, and subject areas. For them, the junior high school program might be expected to be easier to handle than the elementary program. The concern is that, after this elementary experience, the seventh-grade program at Waverley could be boring.

Bluff Street Elementary School

There were two sixth-grade classes at Bluff Street School. Both were self-contained. A description follows of the manner in which each teacher organized instruction in his or her class.

Teacher 401

Teacher 401 assumed the duties of teacher in this class during March. The activity structures of the preceding teacher are not known, since observations and interviews were conducted in May.

Teacher 401 favored whole-group instruction. Spelling, however, was organized to include three ability groups; one large group and two smaller ones. In all subject areas, students worked individually on their assignments, which were the same for everyone. No division of labor was included in the assigned activities.

As can be seen from Table 3.6, this teacher allowed the students some control over content; for example, whether to work in a reading workbook or in the reading kits. They also had some control over pacing in terms of when they did various assignments. The teacher kept control over students' advancement, requiring the students to obtain her approval before they moved to the next assignment. Most academic evaluation was private, although some group evaluation, or praise, was noted during the observations. The observer noted that Teacher 401 was an active monitor of the students' academic activity and expressed

Table 3.6

Teacher 401's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading	- Whole group (SRA kits) - 2-3 go to special reading teacher	- No division of labor	- Selection of workbook or SRA - Pacing over three days	- Academic - individual private - Behavior - individual public and private	- Dependent on teacher to continue SRA; must prove mastery of skill to advance - May advance to another activity, e.g., Math, when reading assign. completed
Spelling	- Large group - 2 in low group - 1 in advanced group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - private written eval. on tests - Academic - occasional public group praise	- Dependent on teacher to advance - Dependent on each other to correct tests - May advance to other activities when assignment completed
Creative Writing	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Choice of idea to write about - Length of paper	- Comments and grades written on assignments - Public, some good material read aloud	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Silent Reading	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of activity: books or magazines	- Behavior - public evaluation of class, e.g., "quiet down"	- Teacher's approval not needed to advance within activity
Math	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of math kit, textbook, or pages created by teacher	- Academic - individual private evaluation	- Dependent on teacher to move to next level - If too many missed on test must do ditto until understand work
Science	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Projects or reports for extra credit	- Academic - individual private evaluation	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Social Studies	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Order in completion of part of the booklet - Choice of resources	- Academic - individual public evaluation	- Dependent on teacher to advance
PE	- Whole group	- Cooperative team effort	- Selection of activity	- Behavior - individual and group evaluation	- None

her instructional intentions and assignment directions with great clarity.

Teacher 402

Teacher 402's self-contained class included both whole-group and small-group instruction. The groups were formed on the basis of ability (see Table 3.7, next page). The teacher used whole groups in Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies. Small groups were used in Spelling and Math. There was no division of labor. Students worked alone on their assignments. Teacher 402 extended to the students control over pacing, allowing anywhere from a day to three days for the students to complete their work in various subject areas. He also extended some control over the content of the activity in Reading. Teacher 402's evaluation of academic progress was carried out both in a public and private manner. His evaluation of behavior typically was public.

After being in the class and observing activities across all the subjects, the observer noted:

> There was a sense of disorganization in this classroom. For example, some assignments were not available for all the students who were required to do them. There was a sense that the teacher was making up the schedule as the day progressed. Several times the students did not know what to do. On more than one occasion, the teacher said something was going to happen and then it never did.

The observer also commented that the teacher required the students to obtain his approval for everything, even though the activity structure was based on some student control. The observer stated, "He really doesn't seem to be interested in letting students make decisions." Finally, the observer noted, "Students seem to get a lot of work done in spite of the management problems."

Summary

Given the activity structures that were observed in the sixth-grade classes at Bluff Street School and were described by the teachers in their curriculum interviews, it appears that the students from this school were accustomed to working with a single teacher for the entire day. Further, the teachers exerted considerable control over the students' assignments and advancement within subjects. In particular, students in Teacher 402's class would have had limited experience with selecting the activities they were to do or the type of product to be produced. As a result, junior high school would be expected to present these students with many new experiences and responsibilities.

Table 3.7

Teacher 402's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading	- 2 groups, 1/2 class work on reading, 1/2 work on math	- No division of labor	- Pacing over 3 weeks • SRA kit • RFU kit - Selection of content of activity	- Academic - individual private - Academic - individual public - Behavior - class and individual public	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity - Occasionally dependent on students if using reading kit
Spelling	- Three ability groups	- No division of labor	- Pacing over 2 1/2 - 3 weeks	- Academic - individual private - Behavior - individual public - Academic - individual public	- Dependent on teacher to correct test before advancing - Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Language Arts	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing within day	- Academic - individual private - Academic - individual public - Behavior - individual public	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Math	- 2 groups, 1/2 class work on math, 1/2 on reading - Small group instruction for spec. material	- No division of labor	- Pacing within day	- Academic - individual private and public - Academic - group public - Behavior - group and individual public	- Dependent on teacher for next assignment (teacher determines capability for advancement to next level) - Dependent on materials availability
Science (half year)	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of materials for drawings	- Behavior - individual public - Behavior - group public	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Social Studies (half year)	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Not discussed	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity

Hawthorne Elementary School

Three teachers taught sixth-grade students at Hawthorne Elementary School. They taught in three semidetached classrooms connected by a common space. For the most part, the students remained with their homeroom teachers, although at times they met together for large-group instruction in Nature or Safety, for movies, and so on.

The three classes were ability-based, with Teacher 601 responsible for the high achievers; Teacher 602, the low achievers; and Teacher 603, the middle group.

The ways in which each teacher organized the class for instruction are described below.

Teacher 601

Teacher 601 taught all academic subjects to the students in her class. In general, for purposes of formal instruction, she used small ability-based groups to teach Math and Reading and whole-group instruction to teach the other subjects. However, as discussed below, students also planned and completed individual contracts that were based upon content covered during the teacher's formal instruction.

As reported in Table 3.8, there was little division of labor, in that students worked alone to complete their work in Reading, Math, Language, and Spelling. However, in Science and Social Studies the teacher used some group projects in which students worked together.

Teacher 601 extended students' control in ways not noted elsewhere in the sixth-grade classes. Each week, each student wrote contracts stating how much work the student planned to complete in the various subjects. Then the teacher and the student discussed the contracts, negotiating whether the student had specified too much or too little work. Thus, the students had some control over both the amount and the content of the work they did. Within the system, the teacher monitored and controlled each student's advancement closely, but the weekly planning suggests some student control over how rapidly each particular student moved through the learning tasks in the various content areas. Academic evaluation was based on a system of private, oral, or written comments and self-correcting feedback devices.

The observer indicated that this class "was extremely well organized and seemingly ran itself with very little obvious, overt direction from the teacher." The observer noted that the teacher "seemed to be very aware of her students' abilities and personalities and varied her responses to their work accordingly."

Table 3.8

Teacher 601's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading Center	- Different ability groups	- No division of labor	- Free reading: choice of book to read, or complete a book report	- Self-correcting (SRA) if problems arise, privilege is taken away - Academic - individual private, teacher re-checks and eval. work - Behavior - class public	- Dependent on teacher to correct worksheet before progressing
Math	- Different ability groups	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - private written evaluation on assignment	- Dependent on teacher correcting assign. Must see teacher to correct problems, then can advance
Language	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Selection of writing assignment	- Academic - private written evaluation on assignment	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Spelling	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - individual private and public; poor work, parents notified by pink slip; star posted for good work	- Dependent on teacher to advance
Science	- Whole group - Small groups	- No division of labor - Some cooperation on group projects	- Pacing within the day	- Academic - class - Academic - individual private - Academic - group private (group projects)	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Social Studies	- Whole group - Small groups	- No division of labor - Explicit role differentiation, groups of 4 for preparation and presentation of projects	- Selection of topic (animal, place) relating to subject assigned	- Behavior - group private - Academic - individual private written evaluation on assignment	- Dependent on teacher for assignment

Teacher 602

Teacher 602 taught all the academic subjects to his class of low achievers (see Table 3.9 on the following page). In his instruction, he used only whole groups. There was no division of labor; students worked alone on their assignments, which were the same for everyone in the instructional group. Little student control was noted. In Science and Social Studies, at various times, students were able to decide the amount of time to spend on a task, with whom to work, and/or the number of activities to complete. The teacher commented that he had tried extending choices, but the students could not handle the responsibility. The teacher appeared to control closely student advancement through an activity. Data on evaluation were sparse, but suggested that Teacher 602 used more public evaluation of academic progress than was typical of other sixth-grade teachers.

Teacher 602 had placed his desk on a platform facing the class where, the observer noted, "He sits with the refrigerator and the coffee pot and stacks of stuff and every so often he makes an announcement." Based on the interactions that occurred during the day of observation, the observer felt the teacher attempted to restrict interaction between the students and himself, as well as among the students themselves. The observer noted that some students talked to no one, peer or teacher, during the entire observation.

Teacher 603

Teacher 603 used both whole-group and small-group instruction. As indicated in Table 3.10 (see page 79), the small groups occurred in Reading, Spelling, and Social Studies. For the most part, the students worked alone on their instructional assignments. At times, in Social Studies, the students worked together in small groups to produce a single, group project. When this occurred, roles were differentiated so division of labor occurred. The amount of control the students had over their work varied from subject to subject. They had no control in Math, some control over pacing in Social Studies, and some control over the daily activity in Language. The language choices included handwriting, creative writing, and word puzzle activities. Similarly, the teacher's control over student advancement varied from subject to subject. Again, the most responsibility was given to students during language instruction. Advancement within several different activities assigned by the teacher was allowed in Math, Social Studies, Science, and Spelling. Evaluation of students' academic work tended to be private.

The observer described the students in this class as "very work oriented." The observer indicated that the teacher was firm and strict in discipline, but friendly, and "showed a sense of humor to which the students clearly related."

Table 3.9

Teacher 602's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Language	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Not discussed in interview or observed	- Dependent on teacher for assignment
Reading	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Control of grade by fulfilling requirements, e.g., must do 2 book reports to achieve "A"	- Academic - individual private, rare	- Dependent on teacher to advance within activity
Spelling	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing in the day to complete workbook assignment	- Academic - individual public evaluation	- Dependent on teacher for advancement
Science	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- 2 week pacing period - Control of grade to work for	- Not discussed in interview or observed	- Dependent on teacher for advancement
Social Studies	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Student may choose whom to work with on project or may work individually - Pacing over 3 week period	- Not discussed in interview or observed	- Dependent on teacher before progressing
Math	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Academic - public as student volunteers answers	- Advance in activity after teacher's approval

Table 3.10

Teacher 603's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	-Academic - group public evaluation -Academic - individ. private -Behavior - ind. pos. & neg. comment	- May advance within activity with teacher's approval
Language	- Whole group	- No division of labor	-Selection of activities, e.g., handwriting booklets, creative writing, word search puzzles	-Academic - individual private written comment on returned assignment	- May advance to other activities when assignment is completed
Social Studies (no text)	- Ability based reading groups	- No division of labor (75% of year) - Small groups with explicit role differtiation (25% of year)	-Pacing within the week, occasionally over 3 week period (self-correcting self-paced kits)	-Not discussed or observed	- May advance within the activity, e.g., may free read, work on report
Science	- Whole group	- No division of labor	-Control of working toward desired grade	-Not discussed or observed	- May advance within the activity, e.g., may free read, work on report
Reading	-Students have own ind. reading book according to grade level -Low readers see remedial reading teacher	- No division of labor	-Pacing over the week, 1 story/week	-SRA cards corrected by students, workbooks corrected by teacher	- Dependent on teacher's approval before progressing
Health	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- No student control	-Academic - individual private grade on homework assign.	- Dependent on teacher for assignment
Spelling	- Small group - 4th - 7th grade workbooks (part of language work period)	- No division of labor - Some levels test each other	- Pacing within the week, 1 unit/week	-Not discussed or observed	- May advance within the activity without teacher's approval

Summary

While the three sixth-grade classes at Hawthorne Elementary School varied in their specific organizational frameworks, all three classrooms afforded the students an opportunity to work in different structures across the subject matter areas. In each class, a typical day for the students involved considerable variety in terms of grouping of students, students' control of work options, etc. However, based on what was learned in the junior high school observations (see next chapter), Teacher 601's class provided a unique setting, as these students were given considerably more responsibility for the design and accomplishment of their learning during sixth grade than was offered in seventh grade. For them, the seventh-grade experience could be expected to be a step backwards in terms of their growth as independent learners. The one aspect of junior high school that the Hawthorne students did not experience was working with different teachers for various subjects. Their elementary instruction had centered around self-contained classrooms.

JM Keynes Elementary School

The sixth-grade classes at JM Keynes Elementary were located in three classrooms opening upon a center area that contained a carpeted platform about a foot high. As discussed below, the students worked on this platform about 80 percent of the time. The three classrooms were empty most of the time.

The types of instructional organization observed in these classes were affected by the fact that it was near the end of the school year. Teachers 701, 702, and 703 had changed their organization of the students for the latter part of the year. Previously the three groups of students moved from teacher to teacher for different subjects during the course of the day. Beginning in April, all the students were taught by one teacher at any given time. As this teacher instructed, the other two either monitored the students' work, circulated about the room assisting students, or corrected papers.

The observer noted that this system resulted in what was described as a static instructional system. The students always sat on the platform, with the "D" and F" students in front. ("D" and "F" referred to students who had received a "D" or "F" in any subject on the last report card.) Instruction was given predominantly in a lecture format with the three teachers taking turns standing in front of the group, delivering an explanation or a lecture. There was some variation across days in the curriculum schedule. For example, the first lesson of the day might be Math on one day and Reading the next. The students were well behaved, sitting passively for the most part. With 90 students together, they were less apt to participate in discussions than students in the other classes that were observed.

When the lesson involved writing, the students wrote on their laps on top of their binders or textbooks. One aspect of this

structure was that the students "must come prepared." After each teacher finished a lesson, the students were given a few minutes before they were to be back for the next lesson. Thus, students scattered to the three rooms to get their textbooks and then returned.

Academic status was clearly defined in terms of the seating area assigned to the students (see earlier point regarding "D" and "F" students). In addition, special groups of either advanced or underachieving students were formed for math instruction. Further, a paid aide worked with the low-ability readers in the three classes, and high-school volunteers were available to assist students as well. There was an extraordinary amount of pressure and expectations for high quality work from all students, compared with the other sixth grades that were observed.

The teachers said they encouraged the students to participate in decision-making processes and gave them opportunities to speak on various matters. "Rap sessions," a time when all students and teachers came together to talk about problems and plans, provided a time for the teachers and students to talk together. These sessions lasted anywhere from ten minutes to two hours depending upon the state of affairs in the cluster at the time.

The teachers said they stressed achievement and productivity. Teacher 702 noted that his students generally achieved at a slower pace after entering junior high school, because the high standards emphasized at JM Keynes School were not maintained.

During the curriculum interviews, the teachers said they conveyed to the students the attitude that teachers were not infallible and could not unilaterally set the "law of the classroom." The teachers believed that "schools should be run for the benefit of the children, not the administration or the teachers." Paramount in these three teachers' thinking was their enjoyment of teaching and of working together as a team.

Descriptions follow of the manner in which each teacher worked with the students while teaching the subjects for which he or she was responsible. The general organizational structure described above prevailed for all three teachers.

Teacher 701

Teacher 701 was responsible for Language Arts, Writing, and Reading. For the most part he used whole-group instruction, even though he taught 90 students at once. The observer noted, "All 80 to 90 students appear to be reading in the same level of the graded reading series." Small groups only appeared in Writing (see Table 3.11). There was no division of labor; students worked on their tasks alone. On Mondays this teacher distributed the assignments for the week; thus, the students had control over pacing during the week. In Language Arts, the teacher granted the students choice over which of several assignment alternatives to complete. For

some assignments students might advance through the week without checking with the teacher, while on others closer checking was demanded. Evaluation of academic behavior varied from private (oral and written) evaluation of individual progress to class-wide discussion of general goals and progress. Behavior typically was evaluated publicly.

Table 3.11

Teacher 701's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Language Arts: Writing	- Whole group - Sm group for writing skill improvement - Sm gp based on high acad. performance	- No division of labor	- Selection of 3-5 projects to work on for unit: e.g., write diary of activities, research of local area, book of poems, novel - pacing over 3-5 week period	- Behavior - individual public, positive and negative - General - class, public	- Independent of teacher for work period
Grammar	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing within week	- Academic - individual private, once every nine weeks - Academic - individual public (rare)	- Dependent on teacher to advance within the activity
Study Hall	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Control of assignment on which to work	- Behavior - individual public	- Not discussed or observed
Rap Sessions	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Control of topic for discussion	- Academic/Behavior - class and individual public	- Dependent on teacher for next activity
Reading	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing over the week to complete assignment	- Behavior - individual and group public - Academic - individual public and private - Academic - class public	- Independent of teacher for advancement

Teacher 702

Teacher 702 also taught Reading. The topics covered in the reading materials included Social Studies and Health. Since there was little difference between Teacher 702's activity structures and the ones already discussed for Teacher 701, a summary is given in Table 3.12 and no additional elaboration is provided here.

Teacher 703

This teacher taught the mathematics program. Teacher 703 had three groups for instruction, although two of the groups were large

Table 3.12

Teacher 702's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading	- Whole group except for students in remedial Track 5 (10 -12 students)	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Behavior - individual public - Behavior - class public - Academic - class public	- May advance to math if reading assignment completed
Study Hall	- Teachers meet with indiv/sm gps when needed	- No division of labor	- Order of completing various assignments	- Not discussed or observed	- Not discussed or observed

and anywhere else would count as "whole-class groups." The two large groups contained 50 and 30 students, and the smaller group had eight. There was no division of labor in this class. Students worked alone on their assignments. As in the other cluster subjects, students received the week's assignments on Monday and could complete the assignments at the pace and in the order they wished, so long as the assignments were completed by the end of the week. The teacher controlled the students' advancement from unit to unit, but not from task to task within an assignment. Evaluation was conducted in both a public and private manner for both academic accomplishments and behavior.

Contrary to the teachers' claims (see earlier discussion), the observer felt that the academic level of the work assigned to the class was not challenging. He stated:

> Academic work in this cluster does not seem to be particularly demanding or challenging. Students often can participate and do rather well without actually learning the intended material. For example, reading workbook exercises are "corrected" in a whole-group recitation format with all 90 students. The workbooks are to be turned in the following day. Thus, there is ample opportunity for students to fill in the answers as they are being "corrected." This kind of activity is much in evidence.

Evaluation of academic progress when Teacher 703 was in charge, as well as when the other teachers were teaching, was franker than might be expected given the teachers' claims that they were concerned about students' opinions. As noted earlier, anyone earning a "D" or "F" was publicly identified on a permanent basis by having to sit in the front of the group. Teacher 701 said this was done to facilitate monitoring and increase time on task. Homework scores were recorded as students stated their results in front of the whole class. The

most common punishment for misbehavior was writing a complicatedly spelled word, such as "rhododendron" or "chrysanthemum" several hundred times. The observer remarked, "The greatest amount of work effort observed during the day was spent in writing such words."

Teacher 703's activity structure elements are summarized in Table 3.13 below.

Table 3.13

Teacher 703's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math	- Large group - Small group - LDG students meet with LDG teacher	- No division of labor	- Pacing completion of the assignment due within the week - Sequence of assignments due during week	- Academic - individual private and public - Behavior - individual private and public - Academic - class public - Behavior - class public	- Due dates, pre- and posttests, and correction of assignments serve as check points

Summary

Several similarities between this cluster and seventh grade were observed. They included experience with a larger peer group than is usual in sixth grade, switching classes and teachers, distinct academic periods, and the necessity of assembling books and supplies for the next period. The latter requirement was salient to Waverley Junior High School and was a difficult one for many new seventh-grade students to master. Further, the practice of giving assignments at the beginning of the week and expecting students to complete them on their own matched many of the junior high school classroom structures. While the observer expressed concern regarding the content and challenge of the work assigned to the students, the general organizational system at JM Keynes School had many features that theoretically should prepare students for junior high school.

Conclusion

Although the activity structures differed across the elementary classes that were observed, the one feature they had in common was diversity of structures across the day. For example, Reading was structured and taught differently than Math in almost all cases. In general, students were given control over the pacing of their work in at least one or two subject areas. In some classes, e.g., Teacher 601, students were expected to select the content of their work as well. Little division of labor was observed. In no instance could these students be expected to know how to work collaboratively or cooperatively with other students to produce a joint product based on their

elementary school experiences. The elementary teachers controlled students' advancement through the curriculum, so the students were accustomed to waiting for the teacher to tell them what to do next. With the exception of Teacher 602, the teachers appeared to provide frequent monitoring of students' work and were accessible to students for feedback about, and assistance with, assigned tasks. In addition, the cluster arrangements at CH Dana Elementary School and JM Keynes Elementary School also prepared students for working with several different teachers during the school day.

In sum, the sixth-grade activity structures that were observed had many features in common with the junior high structures (see next chapter). The major differences between sixth and seventh grade were the self-contained classes that existed in some schools and the greater diversity in activity structures that were observed at the elementary level. This latter difference was unexpected. In fact, one might anticipate the opposite to be true. Thus, the students' reactions to the repetitiveness of the seventh-grade structures will be of particular interest. (See Volume IV of this report.)

CHAPTER FOUR

ORGANIZATION OF INSTRUCTION IN SEVENTH-GRADE CLASSROOMS

In the Junior High School Transition Study, target students were followed from sixth grade into their seventh-grade classes. Within cost and time constraints, the observation schedule was arranged so that, with few exceptions, the target students were observed in both their mathematics and English classes. Other classes were added, based on the matches that could be made among the target students' schedules and the observers' schedules.

The seventh-grade teacher sample for the transition study comprised those teachers who (a) agreed to participate and (b) had target students in one or more of their classes. Observations were conducted in the classes of eleven seventh-grade teachers. This group formed the nucleus staff at Waverley who worked with seventh-grade students for multiple periods during the day. The subjects covered by the teachers included English, mathematics, world history, reading skills, and block, which was a series of nine-week courses in music, art, shop, and home economics. Descriptions follow of the ways in which these teachers organized their classes for instruction. The descriptions are presented in subject-matter clusters in order to facilitate discussion of departmental decisions that may have influenced the activity structures that were established by some teachers. Since three teachers taught two subjects, their activity structures are described twice -- once for each subject area. To provide a basis for comparison of these classes with the sixth-grade classes from which the students came, the same elements of the activity structure utilized in the analysis presented in Chapter Three also are employed here.

English

Seventh-grade English was observed in the classes of three teachers during the study. Observers were present in all of Teacher AA's five classes, Teacher AB's third, sixth, and seventh periods, and Teacher AC's fifth period. Twenty-one of the 24 target students were observed during these nine English periods. Descriptions follow of the ways in which the classrooms were organized for instruction.

Teacher AA

During the first two and one-half months of the school year, which is the timeframe encompassed by the transition study, Teacher AA included reading, spelling, vocabulary, grammar, and composition in his curriculum. This was consistent with the curriculum decisions made at the departmental level.

Table 4.1 summarizes the elements of Teacher AA's activity structure. Teacher AA divided the class into two groups based on reading ability for instruction in reading, comprehension, vocabulary, and spelling. Grammar was taught as a whole-group exercise. Composition was taught both in whole and small groups. The following paragraphs provide information about the content covered and the types of assignments given within each sub-area of the curriculum. This discussion is followed by information about other aspects of the activity structure.

Table 4.1

Teacher AA's Activity Structures

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
English Reading Spelling Vocabulary Grammar Composition	- Two groups based on reading level for reading, spelling, and vocabulary - One large group for grammar and composition	- No division of labor, students worked on assignments individually	- When and order in which to complete weekly assignment	- Nonacademic behavior - public - Academic - private - Some whole-class feedback	- Dependent on teacher to advance beyond weekly assignment - Dependent on teacher during large group instruction

During the first week of school, the students' reading assignments emphasized reading aloud from a play. As each student read one of the "parts," Teacher AA made a judgment regarding his or her oral reading ability.

Teacher AA introduced his weekly format of reading topics during the second week of school, acquainting the students with the instructional patterns he would use in the future. However, the two-group structure was not introduced until the third week. The typical pattern of assignments for reading, comprehension, and vocabulary/spelling included distribution of a full week's activities each Monday. The vocabulary exercise that was included in this assignment package was due on the same day (Monday). Reading and comprehension tasks were due on Friday. Grammar lessons occurred on Tuesdays and

Thursdays. Vocabulary and spelling tests were given on Fridays. Students were given work time in class and could complete the assignments as homework. This procedure allowed the students some control over the order in which their individual assignments might be completed and the amount of in-class time to allocate to an activity. A student might work hard during class and complete most of the weekly assignment there, or work lackadaisically in class and do the assignments at home or elsewhere. Beginning with the second week of school, this structure was observed each week, and Teacher AA used the same activity structure and taught the same lesson to each of his classes each day. The observer commented:

> I am struck by how Teacher AA uses the same format in the five periods of the day. For example, today the same dittoed worksheet was used in each period.

Each week the reading assignments were taken from the texts distributed to the two reading groups. The more advanced group read the Projections text and was labeled the Projections group; the less advanced group read Blasting Off and was called the Blasting Off group. Typically, the assignments required the students to read one or two stories, which comprised a total of 10 to 20 pages of text. Sometimes poems made up part of the assignment. While the students were responsible for reading the stories, Teacher AA also read all or part of the stories aloud to the class at some time during each week.

Each reading assignment included a series of questions to which answers were to be given in complete sentences. Most questions given to the Blasting Off group during the observations appeared to be recall questions, which were specifically answered in the text. Sample questions for the Blasting Off group, taken from the fourth week's assignment sheet, included: (1) "List the steps to be taken in 'belling the cat.'"; (2) "What evidence is there that Nessie [i.e., the Loch Ness monster] is real?"; and (3) "Why did Mary Shelley write Frankenstein?"

The assignments for the more advanced students, the Projections group, appeared to be somewhat more complex. Sample questions taken from their fourth week assignment included: (1) "What do you learn about Herbie in the first eight paragraphs?"; (2) "Describe his personality."; (3) "What is Lucille's role in the story?"; and (4) "Tell what Mr. Guass and Mrs. Gorkin do in the story. Be sure to describe their personalities as you write this answer."

By November, the Projections group assignments contained greater numbers of questions that required more complex comprehension and reasoning abilities. The students now were asked to compare stories, e.g., "Whom do you think is more deserving of the title: 'hero'? Hiawatha or Shikara? Tell why you think so." They also were required to respond to the literary techniques of the author, e.g., "Explain how the death of the postman starts a whole chain of incidents in the plot." Conversely, the questions for the Blasting Off group did not not appear to evolve in terms of depth or difficulty. Sample questions from

a November assignment for students in this group included "Why is each part of the cowboy boot designed as it is?" and "What is the magma called after it leaves the volcano?" This same Blasting Off assignment included a review exercise in which the students were to list and describe the characters and summarize the plot for each of the last six stories they had read.

As noted above, Teacher AA's vocabulary lessons took place on Monday. Each week he selected 15 words from the reading assignments. The students were to learn the meaning and spelling of each word by Friday of that week. On Mondays, the students had a series of vocabulary exercises to complete. These included alphabetizing the list of words, syllabicating each word, and providing the first definition given in the dictionary for each word. Teacher AA described the assignment as "an easy A." The tests given on Fridays consisted of spelling each vocabulary word and matching it with the correct definition, which was written on the test paper. During the fourth week of school, the vocabulary words assigned to the students in the Projections group included the following words, among others: ruefully, contemptuous, humiliate, and depression. Students in the Blasting Off group had a list that included phantom, spawning, fearsome, and prehistoric.

Grammar lessons usually were scheduled on Tuesday and Thursday. Generally, the lesson was based on the text, Language for Daily Use. During the period of observation, the lessons focused on subjects and predicates, nouns and verbs, and sentences and sentence fragments. The students were asked to copy a list of sentences and underline or circle the correct answers, depending on what grammatical concepts were being stressed. For example, during the second week of school, students were to "underline the subject and circle the verb" in sentences such as "That distant siren howled all night" and "She bought four pairs of socks."

Teacher AA began to make composition assignments on the second day of school. The students were asked to describe their first day at Waverley. According to the observer, Teacher AA told the students to write about "lockers, lunch, good and bad teachers, 'foxy' girls, needing the bathroom -- and 'everything' between 8:15 a.m. and the time they left school." The assignment was due at the end of class.

Two other writing assignments occurred during the period of observation. Both were given only to the more advanced Projections group. Students in the Blasting Off group were not observed doing additional writing assignments. The Projections assignments centered around topics in the reading text. For example, the first assignment was to write a paragraph about "why you think Lennie Krieger [a character in a reading story] got what he deserved, or why you think he was unfairly treated."

Teacher AA assigned one book report during the first quarter of the school year. It was due on Monday, November 17. The report was to include two parts. The first was to summarize the book. In the second, a "newspaper" was to be developed by the student, describing

various aspects of the book. It was to include a main article, a sports section, a weather report, an obituary, want ads, and a Dear Abby column. Each article was to be related to the book the student had read. The students had been permitted to select the book for the report, providing it was at least one hundred pages in length.

None of Teacher AA's assignments required the students to work together. Generally, they worked individually at their seats. Further, as noted earlier, there were no formal restraints on the students' capability to proceed through their weekly assignments. However, students could not advance beyond a week-by-week completion of activities.

While the students were working on their assignments, Teacher AA was available to help them, as the observer remarked:

> The teacher has a nice way of working with students as he goes around to give individual help. He won't do problems for them, he doesn't give them the answer, but he gives them hints and encouragement and expects them to find the answer on their own.

In discussing Teacher AA's assignments, two students volunteered an opinion about the work. Student A9 felt the class was "not that hard, but he just doesn't give you enough time [to complete the work]." Student A14 felt the class was "not the greatest," concluding "He gives hard work."

For the most part, Teacher AA relied on written comments and report card grades as a means for communicating his academic evaluations to individual students. When a student was failing to progress adequately, he talked with him or her privately. Teacher AA also told the class as a whole when their work, in general, was failing to meet his standards.

The observer felt that Teacher AA explained his grading system thoroughly to the students. He noted:

> Academic standards were laid out with some explicitness at the beginning of the year. The grading criteria for work on the assignment sheets were discussed with the students.

The narrative protocols from the observations also showed this to have been the case. For example, on the first Monday of school, Teacher AA discussed the assignment sheets with his classes. He described how the vocabulary portion of the paper ought to be done:

> Teacher AA draws a diagram on the board of how the sheet will look. It has name, period, and date at the top; numbers down the left side. He tells the students, "The first thing is to alphabetize the words." Then he explains that they

must syllabicate and define each word. He says, "A basic thing is to use complete sentences."

Further information about the vocabulary requirements was provided a few days later, as described by the observer:

> Someone calls out that they have to write complete sentences, the point being that the teacher has just given a correct one-word answer to a question. The teacher explains, "More important, perhaps, than having it correct is stating it completely." He goes on to say that what he's just written on the board has the right information, but there would be no points for it because it is not in the right, complete form.

Students expressed a variety of opinions about Teacher AA's system of academic evaluation. Student A28 said:

> Well, to get a pretty good grade you have to do all the work that he gives you and make sure you get it in on time. He always says neatness counts, so if it's not neat you get half a grade lower or something like that.

Student A9 agreed and added his own ideas:

> Do the work good. Do it the best you can in his class and you'll get pretty good grades on your papers. Try hard.

Student A5 said that to earn a good grade, a student should "turn in all your assignments . . . and get them right."

Student A13 was one of the few students who was not clear about Teacher AA's criteria for grading. Whether his perceptions resulted from a general inattentiveness is not known. Regardless, Student A13 said:

> He doesn't tell us how his grades work. I have no, absolutely no, idea how to do it. I have no idea how he does his grading system.

Teacher AA used his physical presence, his sense of humor, and his ability to speak in a loud, firm voice to evaluate and control students' nonacademic behavior. Most of these actions were public. As described by the observer:

> Teacher AA is a large man with a full beard. The first day of school he wore a broad tie with a picture of Mickey Mouse on it. He appears to be a jovial fellow. He has a flair for the dramatic and has established quite a stage presence in the class.

The observer further noted that the students saw their teacher as a man with a "temper," ready to shout and to invoke various "dreadful" punishments for misbehavior, such as: "detention after school, referral to the counselor, spanking, beating their brains in, kicking, smashing them against the wall, and so on." Needless to say, most of these were said tongue in cheek, but, nonetheless, Teacher AA's humor and drama served to keep most students "dazzled" during the period of the study. That is, the students learned that Teacher AA could be expected to behave in ways that to them were unusual and unique in a teacher. At the same time, they stayed on task and completed their work in this class. They also liked him as a person.

Student comments during the open-ended interviews that were conducted in October revealed some of their views of Teacher AA. Student A14, a girl, made the following statements:

Interviewer: Do you always obey [Teacher AA]?

Student A14: Yeah. Always.

Interviewer: How come?

Student A14: 'Cause he's so big and he yells a lot.

Interviewer: Would you mind him if he weren't being mean?

Student A14: Yeah.

Interviewer: How come?

Student A14: 'Cause I like him.

Student A9 sounded much the same:

Interviewer: Now what about Teacher AA? Do you always do what he tells you to do?

Student A9: He's big.

Interviewer: He's big, what do you mean by that?

Student A9: He's big and husky.

Interviewer: So that's what makes you want to do what he says?

Student A9: No, it's just that he's real nice, and tells jokes sometimes you know. You do good work in his class to please him.

When asked why she obeyed Teacher AA, Student A28 responded:

> Well, 'cause if I don't do it, he'll get mad and yell. And I don't want him to get mad and yell.
>
> When he's grouchy he yells a lot, and when he yells a lot, he yells loud. Sometimes he's in a pretty good mood, sometimes he's in a bad mood, and when he's in a bad mood, you don't talk.

Student A21 noted:

> Like, if [students] talk out loud, you know really loud, and they keep on throwing things, sometimes he gets mad and screams.

Students understood clearly that Teacher AA was more than drama. He punished students for transgression of the rules. Student A28 commented, "He [gets] really mad and sends you down to the office." Student A9 told us that for "foolin' around and talkin' Teacher AA sends [students] out and keeps them after school." Other students' comments were in the same vein. It is worth noting that these punishments were not based on hearsay; Teacher AA operationalized his threats.

A total of eleven students from Teacher AA's classes were interviewed in October. Nine of these students reported that Teacher AA was "nicer" than most other seventh-grade teachers. They also commented about how much they liked him as a person, as well as a teacher. When asked to describe what characteristics made Teacher AA nice and likeable, the students named several attributes.

Several students said that Teacher AA "likes us all," "likes everybody," and "likes everybody the same." No student made this comment about any other teacher. Teacher AA, according to the students, demonstrated his acceptance of them in two ways. First, he sympathized with the students and their problems, and second, he helped them. Student A28 discussed both points:

> Well, he understands if you don't understand the work. 'Cause he said that when he was little he didn't understand English that much. So he'll just come over and talk to you about [your work] and help you with it.

Student A13 provided another interpretation:

> He doesn't get mad at certain people when they get some [problems] wrong. Whenever somebody gets, you know, good grades, he doesn't say [out loud] "all right," or "good job," or he won't go over to this person and say, "Well, this is a bad grade." He won't do that.

In other words, Teacher AA did not comment publicly on an individual's achievement, because, as Student A13 went on to imply, he did not wish to embarrass people. Further, based on the classroom observations, it was clear that Teacher AA did not feel that one bad grade was significant in the course of a quarter. However, if a student began to receive bad grades repeatedly, Teacher AA responded by addressing the problem directly. Student A13 described this sort of teacher-student interaction:

> He'll talk to you and he'll ask you if you need any special help and he'll try to explain to you what you don't understand.

Student A15 talked about another aspect of Teacher AA, his fairness:

> I like him. He's a nice teacher. He does things fair. If your pencil needs sharpening, he lets you go sharpen it. If you need paper, he lets you have some paper. He doesn't yell at you unless you are absolutely doing something that is disturbing the class.

To interpret the students' statements on a more abstract level, Teacher AA recognized that students had their role to fulfill -- completing their work -- and he did not interfere with them if they went about their business in an orderly manner. Sharpening pencils, obtaining paper, and a bit of talking were considered aspects of completing work and being a good student, so long as they did not disturb others. In contrast, as other teacher descriptions illustrate, many teachers at Waverley did not grant the same sort of responsibility for self-direction to the students.

The observer described yet another facet of Teacher AA's behavior; his skill as a storyteller:

> Teacher AA is an enjoyable storyteller. For example, after school yesterday he told me about some of the problems he had with students last year and how they used to eat pencils. It was an enjoyable story to hear.

The observer went on to describe one class's reaction to a spontaneous tale told by Teacher AA:

> During the sixth period one student answered an example sentence in the textbook by making the sentence, "Teacher AA cooks the best breakfast in town."
>
> The teacher answered, "Indeed, that is correct. He does cook the best breakfast in town." Then he launched into a five minute explanation of how he cooks breakfast on weekends. He told

> them he uses all four frying pans at once on the stove. He always cooks two kinds of sausage. He made his story into quite a display of his cooking talents.
>
> The class appeared to be both enjoying this, interested in what he had to say, and a little bit aghast that he would be so self-proclaiming and present himself as such a terrific cook.

Thus Teacher AA's physical characteristics, his humor and jokes, and his personal concern for his students were aspects of his classroom presence, which his students highlighted. These characteristics delighted and interested his students during the first months of school.

To a certain degree, Teacher AA held both himself and his teaching role up to public examination by the students. He told stories about himself; stories that sometimes had an element of self-mockery or exposed his weaknesses. He parodied the role of teacher as "all teachers are cruel and mean," but showed considerable sensitivity to the students' needs. In various ways, Teacher AA appeared to move beyond the role of teacher as traditionally defined at Waverley. Instead of functioning as an aloof possessor of knowledge and a severe dispenser of punishment whose actions were not open to question, Teacher AA seemed to create a role for himself as a warm, rather humanistic helper of students as they learned. Nevertheless, he did not surrender his prerogatives to punish misbehavior. He was willing to allow the students control of pacing, classroom movement, and talking. In return, he expected the students to complete their work and behave in a rational manner. Teacher AA had his share of discipline problems, which, as we have shown, were dealt with in a stern manner; yet he was stilled well-liked by the students.

For the students, this class was a unique experience that is summarized well by two examples taken from the observation narratives. The observer noted that Teacher AA often referred to his assignments in glowing hyberbolic terms, e.g., "handy-dandy Teacher AA helper sheets" or "something really special." He also indicated that when a student made an error during recitation, and public evaluation was unavoidable, Teacher AA might present his evaluation as burlesque, thus, presumably, taking out the sting. He would say things like, "You might think you're right, Julie, but your wrawngg!!" In conclusion, whatever explanations might be given for the students' performance in this class, the fact that the majority of them stayed on task and completed their assignments successfully, warrants reemphasis.

Teacher AB

Teacher AB's English classes were observed during third, sixth, and seventh periods. In addition, observers were present during her second- and fifth-period world history classes. The activity structure used in her English classes is summarized in Table 4.2 and discussed

below. (The structure in the world history classes is discussed later.)

Table 4.2

Teacher AB's Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
English Reading Grammar Spelling Vocabulary Oral Language Composition	- Two groups based on ability for reading, spelling, and vocabulary - Large group for grammar, oral language, and composition	- No division of labor. Students work individually, except for oral language interview assignment	- Where to complete assignments (school or home) - Order in which to do assignments	- Academic - written comments, occasionally public comments - Nonacademic - public	- Dependent on teacher to advance

Teacher AB included reading, comprehension, grammar, spelling, vocabulary, composition, and oral language in her curriculum, although she did not give composition a large place in her lessons, because, as she told the observer, she did not know how to teach it well. Like the other English teachers, Teacher AB had two groups for reading, comprehension, spelling, and vocabulary. Students were assigned to the groups based on ability. Their ability to read and answer questions regarding a five-page story from the Projections text, which, as noted earlier, was the more difficult of the seventh-grade reading texts, served as a major source of information for assigning the students to the groups. The exercise Teacher AB distributed as part of this pre-assessment activity asked the students to define words and expressions such as mortal, perilous, and folk literature (which had been explained in the story) and to complete open-ended statements in an outline of the story. For example:

B. Animal Tales
   1. Tells how _____.
   2. Stated or implied _____.
   3. Reward in story goes to _____.
   4. May explain in moral terms how animals got _____ or physical traits.

The correctness of the responses helped determine whether a student would be placed in the high or low group. Whenever Teacher AB taught one group, she expected the students in the other group to work alone on their assignments.

Once the students were assigned to the two ability groups, Teacher AB used the same reading texts as Teacher AA, Projections and Blasting Off. Throughout the observation period, Teacher AB's reading assignments included worksheets she had prepared. The observers noted that these worksheets frequently included an outline format and contained no directions regarding what was to be done. Students had to rely on and remember Teacher AB's oral directions to know what was expected of them. For the most part, the worksheets required short fact responses. Analysis or synthesis questions rarely were included.

Vocabulary work included two words per day, which the students were required to define using the dictionary. At the end of each week, a test was given that included the eight words presented Monday through Thursday. The test involved several tasks. For some words, the students matched each word with its definition; for others, the correct word was to be inserted in a blank in a sentence, or the students were to write a definition of the word, based on the way it was used in the sentence given on the test paper. Thus, in most instances, students could rely on recognition and context clues to identify the appropriate vocabulary word for a given response.

The two reading groups received different spelling words on Monday of each week. Generally, the lists included 25 to 30 words. Unlike Teacher AA, these words were not drawn from the reading assignment for the week. Students were given a trial test on the words during the week and a final test that was usually given on Friday, but might occur earlier in the week, apparently when the students did fairly well on the trial test.

When Teacher AB taught grammar, oral language (interviews and speeches), and composition, she taught the entire class as one large group. During the first quarter of the school year, Teacher AB's grammar exercises stressed subjects and predicates. Limited attention also was given to parts of speech and punctuation. Most of the grammar lessons that were observed took place in November. Students were given sentences such as "Sit and think" and "Mother went to the car" and were asked to identify the subject, predicate, nouns and pronouns. They also were given sentences to punctuate, such as "Mary said you are intelligent and beautiful." On several occasions, the sentences to be punctuated (such as the one listed here) could be punctuated correctly in more than one way. Neither the exercise sheet nor Teacher AB clearly stated which approach was to be used.

In spite of Teacher AB's statement regarding composition, two composition lessons were observed. Both spanned several days of classroom work. In each instance, the students wrote a draft paragraph on a topic provided by the teacher. Teacher AB then corrected the paragraphs for spelling, punctuation, etc., and the students prepared a final copy.

Early in the year, Teacher AB utilized an oral expression/interview activity in which pairs of students interviewed one another and then prepared a poster and delivered a speech introducing their interview partners to the other students. In addition, trips to the library

and work on a homework guide were included in Teacher AB's English program.

During all the observations, the students worked by themselves on their assignments. Teacher AB extended some control to the students over where to complete their assignments and, to a lesser extent, the order in which to complete them. Her practice was to distribute a packet of assignments once a week. In contrast to Teacher AA's procedures, Teacher AB had varying due dates on the assignments; different ones were due each day of the week. The students also had control over which book to read for a book report.

For the most part, student advancement was controlled by the teacher. When students interviewed each other for the oral language assignment, they were dependent on their partners for smooth progress through the activity.

Some students reported that they found Teacher AB's class difficult, perhaps due to the lack of directions on the worksheets and the somewhat random pattern for conducting the English lessons. Student A17 called Teacher AB's English class one of her hardest classes. Student A18 discussed with the interviewer the difficulty she was having with the current grammar lesson. As is pointed out in Volume III, these comments are not necessarily negative, in that many students admitted that they learned more in "hard" classes.

In terms of academic evaluation, students received written comments from the teacher on their assignments, as well as grades and comments on their report cards. Teacher AB seldom made a public statement about an individual student's performance to the entire class.

When asked what a student must do to receive a "good grade" in Teacher AB's class, Student A11 said, "Do all your work, and then turn it in, and try to do your best on it." Student A16 made a similar comment in his interview: "Get your work turned in and do it right." Student A22 told the interviewer that, to do well, one should attend to these precepts:

> When Teacher AB's talking, listen to her. Don't chew gum; you can't even have gum. Complete the work and bring the books that you need, because she won't let you go back to your locker.

Students appeared to be less sure about the guidelines Teacher AB used to arrive at their first quarter grades or the grades on their assignments, other than the general requirements for successful performance. For example, Student A16 said, "I don't know," when asked about grades. Student A18 said, "Let's see . . . I can't explain it." Student A11 had some ideas:

> Well, she grades on how many you missed and what you did and how you answered and how neat you did it.

Student A22 provided additional information:

> One third of it [the grade] is on your work. One third of it is on your paying attention. The other third is how well you do your work [how neat it is].

Academically, the students tended to feel the class was difficult. For example, Student A22 said:

> Teacher AB talks about stuff that we don't know. She uses big words. We just go and ask our friends. Like one of us knows how to do it, so you go over and tell the others the same thing, but in small words so it's real easy to understand.

The observer also felt the directions were complex:

> There were a lot of instructions given at the beginning of a period. Sometimes instructions for three or four different kinds of activities were given at once. For instance, Teacher AB would say, "We do this assignment first. Fill in this line. Write it this way. Head the paper the following way. Use this kind of paper rather than that. Turn it in at this time rather than at some other time." It was apparent that many students were not able to follow the instructions or remember them. Many, many questions usually resulted.

The students indicated Teacher AB was an active monitor and was easily accessible to anyone needing help. When asked how he received help in Teacher AB's class, Student A6 replied that he raised his hand, or "[said] 'Teacher AB' and she'll come, or you just go up to her desk and ask her." Student A11 reported, "Well, if she is not busy or something, you can go up and talk to her, or you can go after school, too."

More salient than academic matters to these students, however, was Teacher AB's strict discipline policy. Teacher AB evaluated students' nonacademic behavior publicly and negatively and had a reputation as being strict. Student A22 commented:

> Teacher AB is a little stricter than some of my other teachers. I know if I don't do it, I'll get a detention. She gives out "plans." I know I don't want one.

Student A13 explained what a plan was:

> Well, she'll make you write out . . . Okay, if you got a tardy, you'll have to write out, "I will not get a tardy, even though . . . " and then put whatever excuse you had.

Student A6 noted that "plans" had to be signed by parents, and if students forgot to have their parents sign the plan, a trip to the counselor was required. Both Students A6 and A22 attributed the relatively well-behaved environment of Teacher AB's classes to these plans and to Teacher AB's skill at "handling kids real well."

Teacher AB made few, if any, concessions to her students. Her rules offered the students little freedom. Access to the pencil sharpener, the drinking fountain, and the paper supply were tightly controlled. The observer commented:

> Teacher AB had rules for everything. She put up with no misbehavior whatsoever. She did not accept late papers. She did not accept fooling around. The students knew that they could not get away with misbehaving.

The observer concluded "there was a very great effort on the teacher's part to be organized, structured, and consistent." According to the observer:

> There was a lot of written work. Students were constantly kept busy. It was just 1-2-3, work, collect, next thing; no time for students to get into trouble. Everything was highly structured, highly organized.

The observer felt the structure, consistency, and the "plans" resulted in "very well behaved" students and classes.

In contrast to Teacher AA, Teacher AB spent no time amusing students; storytelling and entertainment were not part of her agenda. Although she kept the students on task, the observer remarked that Teacher AB made "very little effort to motivate the interests and creativity of the students." Further, Teacher AB did not appear to be concerned about the students' feelings. A classroom incident, as reported by a student, illustrates both the teacher's behavior and the student's views of it:

> One person was kicking somebody, fighting -- just the other day, Friday. Teacher AB got really mad. She goes, "I want you to keep your hands to yourselves."
>
> This one guy, he wasn't in the fight, he goes, "Hey, you know, they were playing around."
>
> Teacher AB goes, "Come here! Get a plan!"
>
> And I don't think it was fair. The person who got hit, he goes, "Teacher AB . . . "
>
> Teacher AB goes, "Quiet! I'll take care of my own problems."

Thus Teacher AB's class was highly structured, and, for the most part, teacher-directed. Students were expected to be on task; off-task behavior was punished, usually with a "plan."

It is interesting to note that the activity structure elements in this class were similar to those in Teacher AA's class. Two groups, weekly assignments, some (but limited) student control, no division of labor, private evaluation of academic performance, public evaluation of nonacademic performance, and teacher control of student advancement. Yet, the teaching-learning environment in the two classes appeared to differ. Although both teachers maintained tight control over students' on-task behavior, Teacher AA did so in a manner that was perceived by the students as friendly and caring. Teacher AB was not viewed in this way. Further, within the structure, students were allowed to interact with and assist one another in Teacher AA's class as long as they did not disrupt others. Such student-to-student interaction was discouraged in Teacher AB's class. Hence the interrelationship of the "feeling," as well as the structure, of these classrooms with students' academic performance is of interest. This is pursued further in the summary and conclusions portion of Chapter Two of this volume and in Volumes IV and VII of the report.

Teacher AC

Teacher AC was observed in his fifth-period English class. As he was only observed in one period, the data are sparse, and it is not possible to discuss his class in the same detail as the other two seventh-grade English classes in the sample.

Even though Teacher AC was observed only in the one class, it is worth noting that he did not teach the same lesson over and over during the various periods of the day. He arranged his weekly plan so that every class received the same lessons, but on different days. He explained his system to the researchers:

> I have a system in my class where I stagger all the things that are being done during the week. All the classes do the same thing, but not on the same day. It keeps me fresh. I never do the same thing twice during the day. I don't say, "Oh, my God, it's sixth period, seventh period, and I've gone through this five times a day." I don't get bored; it's not fair to the students if I'm bored. It might sound confusing at first, and, unfortunately, I've had all the other teachers in the department rebel against doing this. But it can be organized very well.

During the period of the study, Teacher AC taught reading, comprehension, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, oral language, and composition. The oral language component consisted of students interviewing classmates and reporting the results of the interview in a speech to the class.

On all the days observed, Teacher AC appeared to the observer to have only one group, but Teacher AC reported:

> Each class is divided into two reading groups. This particular class that is being observed is quite unusual, in that, out of the 25-odd students I have in there, only one student is in the low group.

This pattern of grouping in reading, spelling, and vocabulary conformed to that of the other two English teachers and to the English Department's policy.

Teacher AC's reading and comprehension activities were devoted largely to silent reading, with accompanying teacher-made worksheets. Like Teachers AA and AB, Teacher AC used the Projections and Blasting Off texts. Diagnosis of students for placement in the texts was based on oral reading ability.

Grammar lessons were taken from the Language for Daily Use text, which also was used in the other classes. Sentences, sentence fragments, subjects, and predicates were the main topics covered during the observation period.

Spelling and vocabulary tests were given once a week. For vocabulary, the tests consisted of students matching words with definitions that were dictated (read) by Teacher AC. During vocabulary, Teacher AC also worked with the students on prefixes, suffixes, and root words. An example exercise required the students to identify root words and prefixes involving numerical references, such as uni, duo, and quad. In addition, the students were asked to draw a monster illustrating various prefixes, such as tricranial, septnasal, etc. Homonyms and antonyms also were studied.

Students in Teacher AC's class were given one writing exercise per week, which was more than the students in the other two classes were required to complete. Typically, the exercises included two stages of activity. First, the students listed the items, attributes, etc., they planned to write about. Then, they formed these statements into paragraphs.

Unlike the other teachers, Teacher AC included oral reading of a play in the schedule at least once a week. The plays were short and focused on adolescent-relevant topics, such as drugs or alcohol; some were comedies. Students were assigned parts and were expected to portray the characters' feelings, etc., as they read.

As noted in Table 4.3, except for the interviewing activity and the oral reading of the plays, no division of labor was observed in Teacher AC's class. The students worked alone on their assigned tasks. Teacher AC was not observed extending opportunities to the students to control their own work. He assigned all tasks, along with their due dates. Student advancement in Teacher AC's class typically was limited to advancing within a teacher-assigned activity. Teacher AC evaluated students' academic progress privately, almost always in the form of written comments or grades.

Table 4.3

Teacher AC's Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
English Vocabulary Spelling Grammar Composition Oral Language	- Two groups based on reading level for Reading, Spelling, Vocabulary - One group for Grammar and Composition	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Behavior - public and negative - Academic - private and written	- Dependent on teacher during recitation - Dependent on teacher to move to new assignment

When asked what was required to do well in Teacher AC's class, students responded with a mixture of precepts governing academic and nonacademic activity. For example, Student A25 said:

> Well, you have to turn in your work on time, and you gotta be quiet when he tells you to. And you have to bring your materials to class like your books, and hand in everything on the right days.

Student A10 reported:

> He has five rules: respect for your classmates and being honest . . . not playing around, not talking, and . . . turn in your work on time.

When students violated nonacademic rules, according to Student A24, who had known Teacher AC as a neighbor most of his life:

> He doesn't write your name on the board or anything. He will just tell you to be quiet and that is all he does. Or looks at you and warns you. Gives you a mean look or something.

Student A24 also said:

> Usually when he does it [reprimands students] he does it to make them laugh or he is smiling. I don't know why. Just the way he looks at you. Or he will tell you that you are talking a lot and you're louder than the rest of the class.

Student A25 reported "talking too much" as "one of my weaknesses," and Teacher AC subsequently recorded this behavior on the progress report. Student A25's parents apparently were cross with him and a teacher-parent conference ensued.

Nonetheless, both Students A24 and A25 reported they "liked" Teacher AC and that he was "nice." Other students said the work was hard, and Teacher AC did not allow them time enough to complete it.

Teacher AC reported positive perceptions of the class that was observed:

> Right now, each one of them [the students] is a responsible student and a responsible human being and citizen in that classroom. I look forward to going to them after lunch. They're a bunch of neat students.

Summary

As might be expected, based on the collaborative planning done by the teachers in the English Department at Waverley, the activity structures of the three teachers who were observed showed more similarities than differences. The content was much the same, in spite of each teacher's instructional idiosyncracies (e.g., Teacher AA did not do interviewing and speeches at the beginning of the year, Teacher AB downplayed composition, and Teacher AC did more composition and oral reading of plays than the other two teachers). All three teachers used ability groups for reading, spelling, and vocabulary. This grouping was an arrangement established by English Department policy. The groups provided few opportunities for students to interact with one another, either socially or academically, since seating was not arranged by groups and academic interaction was largely teacher-directed recitation or consisted of reading aloud to the group by the teacher or students. However, Teachers AA and AC allowed students to interact informally as long as the talking did not interfere with completion of assigned tasks. Some of this interaction was academically oriented and occurred among group members who had the same assignments. Teacher AB restricted all student-to-student interaction.

All three teachers allowed students some control over where and when they did various parts of their assignments, but the students' only control over content was in the selection of a volume for a book report.

A major difference among these teachers was the type of teacher-student interactions that occurred within the activity structures. Teacher AA "entertained" the students with his side comments more than the other teachers; Teacher AC was friendly, but firm; Teacher AB was more "strict." The students in all three classes reported that they thought the teachers were "hard," but they liked them.

Math

Seventh-grade mathematics was observed in three teachers' classes at Waverley during the months of September, October, and November: Teacher AD's first-, fifth-, sixth-, and seventh-period classes; Teacher AE's second-, third-, and seventh-period classes; and Teacher AJ's second-period math fundamentals, a remedial class. It is important to note that Teacher AJ taught world history for the other periods of the day. Twenty of the 24 target students were observed in their math classes. A description follows of the ways in which these three teachers structured their classes.

Teacher AD

Teacher AD used an activity structure featuring recitation and seatwork (see Table 4.4). During seatwork, students worked independently at their seats. As a rule, everyone had the same assignment, although occasionally there was some differentiation based on ability. The only choice students had was the frequent option to finish work at home.

Table 4.4

Teacher AD's Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math Whole number operations Sets Operations on fractions	- Whole class (Two exceptions when two groups were formed)	- No division of labor	- Pacing, could finish work at home	- Behavior - negative and public, often audible to entire class - Academic - written and private	- Dependent on teacher to advance

Evaluation in Teacher AD's classes was somewhat different from the norm at Waverley. First, he evaluated behavior without mentioning names of the students, thus communicating the impression that everyone was being evaluated for the infractions of a single or a few students. For example, in his first-period class, the observer noted that Teacher AD said to the entire class, "Don't forget, we raise our hands when we want to talk." The observer in the fifth-period class recorded Teacher AD saying, "I wonder if we are going to have to send someone out? The minute you disturb this class, out you go."

Second, Teacher AD graded students' papers on the basis of the number of problems correct of those attempted rather than the number correct based on the length of the assignment. Thus, if an assignment had 20 problems and a student completed 14 of 15 correctly, the student's score would be 93 percent rather than 70 percent (14 of 20). Teacher AD also frequently read the answers to the work before he collected it. Thus students could correct or complete their papers as the teacher read the answers.

The content of this math class during the first quarter was almost entirely review of material contained in the fifth- and sixth-grade mathematics texts, including place value, whole number operations, introductory set theory, and fractional operations. Place value assignments were observed during the first and fourth weeks of the school year. The Week One assignment required the students to place commas in numerals so that hundreds, thousands, etc., were designated. A brief discussion also was held regarding how the same quantity would be written using bases other than ten. The Week Four assignment involved representation of a given quantity in numerical form or through use of words. A puzzle in which words were used to designate a particular number also was assigned. To solve the puzzle, the students were to change the words to numerical representations.

Assignments related to whole-number operations were observed frequently in Teacher AD's classes. Sample problems from observation days spread across the Fall Quarter demonstrate the extent to which content covered in fifth- and sixth-grade was repeated. Problems included in the worksheets assigned during the first week of school were 7210 - 56 = ____, 58 x 8 = ____, and 6001 x 708 = ____. While Teacher AD may have been using such problems to diagnose students' skills, an assignment given in the fourth week of the school year suggested that either the students had not acquired basic whole-number operation skills or were repeating computational skills they had already mastered. This assignment included column addition, subtraction without zeros, division problems such as 938 ÷ 2 = ____, and multiplication problems such as 39 x 74 = ____. Word problems also were included. Two such problems were "What is the total cost of a 3-cent eraser and a 4-cent pencil?" and "How much do you pay for 3 pounds of candy at 32 cents a pound?"

In November, whole-number-operations assignments included two-digit column addition, division problems such as 3368 ÷ 5 = ____, and multiplication problems such as 89 x 76 = ____. By this time, the word problems appeared to have increased in difficulty. For example, the students were asked to solve the following:

> Car A costs $6500 and gets 25 miles per gallon.
> Car B costs $5500 and gets 20 miles per gallon.
> Each car is driven 10,000 miles per year and
> gasoline costs $1.50 per gallon. In how many
> years does the savings in gasoline equal the
> difference in price between the two cars?

Work related to set theory also was assigned. It covered the definition of a set and subsets and some simple set operations.

By November, Teacher AD also was assigning problems that required addition, subtraction, and multiplication of fractional numbers. Although these operations were more complex than the place-value, whole-number, and set-theory problems, it must be noted that they, too, repeated concepts and skills presented in the fifth- and sixth-grade mathematics texts. Examples of the types of operations that were to be done are 11 x 3/4 = ____, 14 3/8 - 5 1/22 = ____, 2 7/12 + 5 11/12= ____. The students also were asked to add columns of three or more fractions.

While there were pedagogical reasons, no doubt, for the extensive review that was observed in Teacher AD's class, no arrangements were made for alternative work for those students who had already mastered the elementary school math syllabus. This resulted in some behavioral and motivational problems in his classes.

Based on the activity structure information presented earlier in Table 4.4 and the content information discussed above, Teacher AD's classes thus could be expected to follow a routine in which the students worked on concepts they had studied in elementary school and may or may not have mastered already. After discussing the day's assignment with the entire class, perhaps working a few problems at the board or calling the students' attention to the explanations in the textbook, Teacher AD might be expected to direct the students to begin solving a number of problems in their textbooks. They then would work individually and quietly at their seats, asking the teacher for assistance when needed. If they were unable to finish their work at school, they could finish it at home.

Although the scenario described above seems logical, given the basic structure of the class, the actual routine was dramatically different than the one just described. The following excerpt, drawn from the observer's narrative description of the fifth-period class, provides the gist of what actually occurred many days in Teacher AD's classes.

> When the bell rings, the class becomes quiet until one student starts coughing. The coughing spreads throughout the room. One person coughs and then the next coughs so that the coughing just spreads. The teacher offers a mild reprimand, "Let's quiet down. Let's be quiet."
>
> Then the student in the second seat next to the windows yells, "What's that terrible smell?"
>
> At that point, the teacher suggests the students get to work and passes out some worksheets. While he's making the announcement, whistling and talking go on around the room. One student wads up some paper and throws it out the window. Someone else sharpens a pencil.

> A girl across the room from the pencil sharpener yells, "Will someone over there sharpen this pencil for me?" and throws her pencil across the room.
>
> The teacher says, "I wonder if we are going to have to send someone out? The minute you disturb this class, out you go."
>
> The noise from the students continues. One student starts singing the "Star Spangled Banner," and several others join in. Next, someone starts with the "Pledge of Allegiance." Everyone picks that up until it has gone around the room.

While this excerpt raises any number of concerns, we will focus on three of them. First is the extent to which this passage describes typical behavior in the fifth-period class and other classes. Second is the teacher behaviors that seemed to accompany and perhaps develop these disorderly classes. And, third, the students' reactions to the apparent collapse of order in the class will be considered.

There is little doubt that the above behavior was typical of Teacher AD's fifth-period class. According to the observer who recorded in this period, the fifth period was the "worst," but the others also were rowdy. For example, Student A15 described the sixth-period class:

> People sit there spitting on the walls and Teacher AD just sits there smiling at us. He doesn't do nothing for anything. It's hard to work when everyone's yelling, screaming, and spitting.

Student A6 described the first-period class:

> Students call him "Buggsie," all that stuff. They sit and make faces at him. A lot of people, they don't treat him right, you know. They always make fun of him.

Student A28 described the seventh-period math class:

> He really ignores a lot of stuff. Like people call him "Buggsie" right in front of him and he'll just sit there. You don't really get in trouble in his class. You can pop bubbles in class and all that stuff and he'll just sit there.

(Note: Buggsie, the students' epithet for Teacher AD, referred to his alledged resemblance to a cartoon rabbit.) These examples, and there were many others in the interviews and protocols, suggest that all Teacher AD's classes were noisy, disorderly, and ill-mannered.

With regard to how Teacher AD contributed to the rowdiness of his classes, there are no doubt many answers. As already has been

noted, the work in Teacher AD's class was below the achievement level of many students, a fact they complained about in their interviews. Students A14 and A28 called the work "easy." Student A6 said, "A lot of the stuff is review." The observer noted Student A23 stating in class, "This class is just like kindergarten. We don't do anything." Besides assigning "easy" work, Teacher AD assigned short assignments and then, as noted earlier, did not require students to finish all the problems to obtain a high score based on the percentage of correct answers. He also did not require the students to complete the work in class. Thus, not only were many of the students not challenged by the mathematics material, they also did not have enough work to fill their time in class.

In addition, students were virtually unanimous in reporting that Teacher AD refused to answer questions. Student A13 noted:

> If you go up to sharpen your pencil or ask him a question about math, he'll just tell you to sit down before you get a chance to ask him a question.

Student A5 reported:

> You raise your hand. You sit there for five minutes. He looks at you and then goes on to another person. It's like he's blind or something. Your raise your hand and five minutes later this other kid raises his hand. So, he goes over there. He, like, ignores you. Then he finally comes over to you.

Student A18 further developed this complaint, stating that, when offered, Teacher AD's help was often useless:

> You'll ask him a question, like I raised my hand and I had worked the problem out, and he had the answers on the board, and I go, like, "It's wrong, I don't understand what's happening."
>
> And he goes, "Well, you did it wrong," and put my paper down and left.
>
> I knew I did it wrong. I wanted to know <u>what</u> I did wrong.

These examples suggest that Teacher AD was slow to answer students' questions. His responses, when they occurred, were often little more than "brush-offs." The students saw this as abandonment of part of the teacher role. As Student A18 said, "He's a teacher; he should teach."

Another of Teacher AD's behaviors that contributed to the collapse of his classes was the rarity and ineffectiveness of punishment. Students were almost unanimous in reporting that Teacher AD did not operationalize his threats and punish students for misbehavior. For example, during the classroom segment quoted above, in which the paper

throwing, singing, etc., occurred, no individual was reprimanded or punished for misbehavior. In the interviews, a few students said they had witnessed a classmate being referred to the office. However, most students could only report rumors of referral or hypothesize that misbehavior would end in punishment. They had not been present when Teacher AD had followed through on his threats regarding misbehavior.

Relative to the students' reaction to the widespread and repeated disorder in Teacher AD's classes, many students responded by misbehaving in this class when they did not do so in other classes. The case description of Student A25, for example, indicates that, at the beginning of the year, he was well-behaved and stayed on task. By the end of the third week of school, however, he had not only joined in the disruptions, but was a leader, as well. In fact, as the year progressed, his behavior often took the form of direct assaults on the teacher: insults, making faces, coordinated disturbances, pantomimed knifing, etc. According to Student A14, these incidents often were planned in advance:

> My friends, we all get together and do stuff, like cough at a certain time, start raising our hands all at the same time and everything.

Some students attempted to alter the situation by using the school structure. Student A18, who worked quietly and even told her classmates to be quiet, wrote a letter to Teacher AD explaining that she had problems with the material and requesting more help. When she received no response, she approached the counselor, asking his assistance. While the counselor's exact answer was not recorded, Student A18's mother reported in mid-November that her daughter had failed in her attempts to improve her lot, so gave up and began talking out like the rest of the students.

Some students, such as Student A6, tried to remain on task during class and refrained both from interaction with Teacher AD and from participation in the disruptions, at least during the observation period.

Students' opinions regarding Teacher AD generally were negative. One student said, "I don't know what he likes. He's so weird." Another student said, "I fool around in class because I don't like him. I don't listen to him." Student A15 said, "He's not even considered a teacher, sometimes, the way he acts."

Hence, instead of being recognized as a leader, a source of knowledge, a dispenser of punishment, etc., Teacher AD became a nonteacher to his students. In adopting this role (a role he never articulated to the students), he also appeared to force the students to adopt new definitions of the student role. For the most part, their role was much less cooperative and much more confrontational than in other classes.

In this classroom climate, success, social, and dependent student participation styles were maladaptive. Alienate, phantom, and/or

isolate students were adaptive. Social students, for example, who engage in certain on-task behaviors, such as peer teaching, contributing to lesson progression, and raising their hands to answer questions, found these behaviors hard to implement when everyone else was off task. Success students who typically have a high time-on-task found this a difficult feat in a class where such behavior was negatively reinforced by both students and the teacher. Similarly, dependent students, who need the teacher's assistance to complete an assignment, received no such assistance in this class, since Teacher AD declined to help them.

We have already argued that essentially two paths were open to students in Teacher AD's class; they might participate in the rowdiness or become withdrawn phantom or isolate participants. The difference between the two participation styles was largely determined by how well the particular student worked independently. Teacher AD's classes appeared to provide students little opportunity for academic success.

Teacher AE

Teacher AE was observed in three of her five seventh-grade math classes. These included her second-, third-, and seventh-period classes. According to the observer, Teacher AE taught the same lessons to each of the seventh-grade classes that were observed. Even though the teacher told the observer that periods two and three were like "night and day" in both behavior and ability, she did not change her behavior and management for these periods.

During the first quarter of the school year, Teacher AE concentrated on whole-number operations, set theory, and number theory, reviewing and practicing skills the students had been taught in elementary school. Students were assigned this review work whether or not they had already achieved mastery of these skills. In their interviews, students commented on the content of the work. Student A16 said, "We did every bit [of work] last year. Most every bit of it." Student A7 agreed, stating the following during the interview:

Interviewer: Student A7, do you think seventh grade is harder than sixth?

Student A7: So far it's not. In math, we're learning division, which we already know. The only thing I've learned new in math was casting out nines.

However, unlike Teacher AD's class -- where constant review was coupled with short assignments and no requirement to complete the work -- Teacher AE provided plenty of work. Student A11 said the hardest part of Teacher AE's class was the amount of work, adding, "Well, there is a lot of work. She's always getting out work, it seems." Student A9 found all the work tiring, stating, "It's not too hard. It's just kind of tiring to work all of those times [multiplication problems]."

Most of Teacher AE's assignments were taken from the textbook or written on the chalkboard. She used fewer dittoed worksheets than Teacher AD. Early in the school year, whole-number operations concentrated on addition of three numbers of three digits each and on subtraction. As noted above, Teacher AE taught the students to check their answers by casting out nines. Later, assignments included multiplication with factors ending in zero and long and short division.

From time to time Teacher AE assigned mathematical vocabulary words. The student were required to learn the definitions of terms such as "commutative property," "associative property," and "sum." Later, set theory terms were assigned, including "union," "intersection," and "empty set."

Place-value assignments included oral reading of numerals, work on expanded notation and use of exponents, and discussions of the Egyptian and Roman numeration systems.

During the November observations, Teacher AE's lessons concentrated on number theory. Odd and even numbers, factors, and rules for divisibility were discussed in the classes. The students were given assignments to practice the concepts that were discussed. For example, the divisibility rules assignments required the students to indicate whether 25 different numbers were divisible by 2, 3, 6, 9, 5, and 10. The numbers ranged in magnitude from 15 to 15,003.

Teacher AE did not begin work on fractions during the Fall Quarter.

Occasionally, Teacher AE played an inquiry game with the students. However, based on the observation data, it was not clear that the students understood the conceptual or inquiry-skill-building purposes of the game. Each time, their attention seemed to be focused on random identification of an object in a box, rather than systematic accumulation of information that would lead to discovery of the essential characteristics of the object.

Students were unanimous in stating that turning the work in on time was an essential ingredient of obtaining a good grade in this class. Student A16 claimed there were only two rules in Teacher AE's class: "Do it [the work] and get it in on time." Student A10 claimed the key to a good grade was to "get the work done; turn it in." As a final example, Student A21 stated, "Complete the work, do it neat, do it right, listen, and you'll earn a good grade." Thus, although the content was review, Teacher AE provided enough work to fill class time (plus two homework assignments per week) and convinced the students that accurate and total completion of the work, as well as getting the work done on time, were essential for earning a good grade.

As noted in Table 4.5, Teacher AE used one instructional group. Work activities included a mixture of recitation and seatwork. The observer noted the teacher using two groups only once during the observations. The observer felt these groups were based more on the speed with which the students were working than accuracy or ability.

No division of labor was observed. Students worked individually on their own assignments. Teacher AE did not extend control over the work activities to the students; she made all assignments and set all due dates. For their advancement through the lessons, students either required the teacher's approval to move ahead or they could proceed through an assignment on their own. In no instance could they move to the next assignment without teacher approval. Rather than give one assignment that lasted an entire period or several days (as some teachers did), Teacher AE seemed to favor short activities. She typically assigned a number of problems and then, after a certain period of time, assigned some more. Thus students who finished the first batch of problems quickly had to wait for the teacher to announce the next set before they could continue their work.

Table 4.5

Teacher AE's Math Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Math Whole-number operations Set theory Number theory	- Whole class; two groups used during one observation day	- No division of labor	- No student control	- Nonacademic behavior - negative and public - Academic - positive and negative, private written comments	Dependent on teacher to advance

Public evaluation in this class was largely focused on reprimanding students for misbehavior. The observer's narrative descriptions provided numerous examples of Teacher AE's style when controlling behavior:

> Teacher AE says, "Hey, hey" to Student A26, when he begins to turn around to talk to a neighboring boy.
>
> There continues to be a lot of noise coming from the window side of the room where Student A26 sits. The teacher says, "Student A26, I would hate to send you out again today."

On another occasion:

> Someone crosses in front of the teacher and says that he has to throw something away. The teacher says, "All right, but do it from the back of the room next time. You're interrupting the class."

In the above examples, the observer noted that Teacher AE seemed to speak in an almost kindly way. Less frequently, she was firm, even cross, as in the following instances:

> Student A8 begins to talk loudly. Teacher AE puts her hand on Student A8's shoulder and says in a harsh tone, "Just keep it down here."

On another day:

> Teacher AE says to Student A8, "Hey! What are you doing? Put that book back in there. Take one of these used ones if you've forgotten your book, but you leave those drawers closed."

Based on their interview comments, the students appeared to have decided that Teacher AE generally did not move beyond verbal reprimands when problems arose in the classroom. For example, these exchanges occurred in one of the October interviews:

> Interviewer: What do students get in trouble for?
>
> Student A7: I never see anybody get in trouble at all.
>
> Interviewer: Yeah?
>
> Student A7: I don't think she [Teacher AE] really . . . I think she just gives warnings 'cause I've had a lot of 'em.
>
> Interviewer: How about you, Student A16?
>
> Student A16: I've never seen anybody get in trouble in that class.
>
> Interviewer: Do you get warnings, too?
>
> Student A16: Oh, at least one a day.

In the November interviews, Student A17 also indicated that Teacher AE was a clement disciplinarian:

> Student A17: Teacher AE doesn't stand on you or watch you like a hawk or anything. She talks real quiet. Most everybody in my class is okay.
>
> Interviewer: So what do students get in trouble for in Teacher AE's class?
>
> Student A17: Talking. A lot of kids throw papers and then they get in trouble. And

then they have to sweep the floor up with the papers. Nothing too big.

Interviewer: Anything else?

Student A17: Well, she gets a little irritated when you blow a bubble while she's talking.

Only Student A9 claimed to have observed strong punishments. He said Teacher AE would send miscreants "out of the room, make you stay after school to do your work, send you to the assistant principal." Thus, while Teacher AE punished students for misbehavior, it was seldom enough that some students had not observed her doing so, while others remembered her admonishments as having been given in a mild tone of voice that was not perceived as "real punishment." In general, Teacher AE was considered to be reasonable in her disciplinary actions by most students.

Commonly, students said they found Teacher AE's class to be pleasant. Student A21 called Teacher AE "nice" and Students A16 and A17 said Teacher AE's math class was their "favorite class." Student A7 said Teacher AE was "kind of fun . . . she's nice." "Fun" and "nice" were two words students at Waverley used to describe classes and teachers they enjoyed (see Volume V for discussion). It is important to note that these terms were not synonymous with "easy"; instead, they denoted that the students found doing the work was "worth it" and pleasant, notwithstanding the sizeable workload Teacher AE assigned each day.

Academic evaluation in Teacher AE's class was usually private and, in the main, written on corrected assignments and tests and on report cards. As noted above, most students understood, or thought they understood, the principles guiding Teacher AE's evaluation of academic achievement. As mentioned earlier, and as Student A21 said, "Complete the work, do it neat, do it right, listen," were the main standards.

Most students felt Teacher AE allowed them ample access to her for help. Student A13 said, "She helps whoever raises their hand and needs help." Student A11 echoed these comments, saying, "She gives help to anybody who needs it." Teacher AE was mobile, moving about the room from student to student during much of each class period. The following excerpt from the narrative protocols helps to illustrate Teacher AE's monitoring techniques:

> Student A8 turns around to talk to his neighbor, Vince.
>
> Teacher AE says, "If you need help, I'll try to help you."
>
> Student A8 smiles and raises his hand. The teacher goes to him and explains union of sets.

When the observer returned to this classroom in November, after a month's absence, she noted that Teacher AE seemed tired. Teacher AE

was walking around the classroom less and was using a wheeled stool to move about. However, the observer's informal remarks suggested that Teacher AE still actively monitored the students' academic performance, as well as their behavior, and provided help whenever someone needed it. The only notable difference was in the number of times Teacher AE went to the students' desks to assist them; now they seemed to come to her more often, instead.

To summarize, Teacher AE used an activity structure that changed little from day to day. Students had no control over their work content, timing or procedures. During the first quarter, the content of the classes was largely review of math skills and concepts the students had learned in elementary school. This also was the situation in the other math classes. Apparently, the seventh-grade text repeated much of the elementary curriculum. Nonetheless, Teacher AE challenged the students by the large amount of review work assigned. She actively monitored the students' academic and nonacademic behavior. No student reported negative feelings about her class, and many spontaneously informed the interviewer that they liked the class and the teacher.

Teacher AJ

Teacher AJ taught one math class, math fundamentals, which was a remedial class for seventh-graders. In addition, she taught seventh-grade world history. (See next section of this chapter for discussion of these classes.)

Remedial classes at Waverley were limited to 15 students each, half the number normally assigned to a class. The content of this remedial math class, during the first quarter, was a review and extention of whole-number operations. In one of her self-reports, Teacher AJ stated, "My goal [in math fundamentals] is to improve their comprehension of basic math skills. At the end of the first semester, the successful student will add, multiply, divide, and [subtract] whole numbers with 70 percent, or better, accuracy."

Teacher AJ began the year with a series of diagnostic tests. These were used for two purposes. If a student performed well on the tests, he or she was moved into a regular seventh-grade math class. For those students whose performance indicated they belonged in remedial math, the data indicated the areas of weakness on which their work should concentrate.

Place value and numeration were the first skill areas covered in the class. At first the students were required to convert numbers from words to numerals and vice versa. Then they were asked to identify the lesser of two numbers and use the < and > signs appropriately. Next, they practiced rounding numbers to the nearest 10 or 100.

Most of the Fall Quarter was devoted to whole-number operations. Addition and subtraction were taught in October. By November, the

students were doing multiplication and division problems. The multiplication problems included two-digit factors such as 79 x 63 = ____. The division problems had one-digit divisors. All assignments emphasized drill. Timed worksheets, puzzles, and oral drill were used regularly.

As noted in Table 4.6, Teacher AJ used either one instructional group or divided the class into three groups for instruction. When choosing to use only one group, Teacher AJ discussed the concepts of the assignment with the students and distributed a worksheet to the entire class. Then she and two eighth-grade student aides monitored and helped the students. On other days, she divided the class into three groups, with different assignments for each group. Teacher AJ then monitored and helped one group, while the aides helped the other two.

Table 4.6

Teacher AJ's Math Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Remedial Math Place-Value Numeration Whole-number operations	- Whole class - Some use of three groups	- Math games with team cooperation - Students completed assignments independent of other students (most often)	- Pacing within assignment	- Behavior - public, negative (rarely observed) - Academic - private written comments	- Dependent on teacher to advance to new assignment

Teacher AJ used two forms of division of labor. Several times, the class was observed involved in games where various groups competed against one another. Usually, however, the students worked individually on their assignments. No student control was noted by the observer, except over pacing. Most of the time, the teacher allowed the students to advance at their own rates within an activity or assignment. On occasion, Teacher AJ asked the students to work one problem at a time and then check with her or an aide.

Compared to other classes, few evaluations were observed in this class. Those that did occur were public comments on students' off-task behavior. Academic evaluation was written as comments and grades on assignments and tests. However, it should be noted that placement in this remedial class, in and of itself, implied a strong, negative, public evaluation of the students.

Only one student, Student A12, was observed in this class. As she declined to be interviewed, there are no student opinions available on the nature of students' experiences in this class.

At the end of the observation period, Teacher AJ commented that she enjoyed teaching the math fundamentals class. This was confirmed when Teacher AJ lobbied successfully to teach the class again for the second semester of the school year.

One aspect of this class that the observer found particularly noteworthy was Teacher AJ's monitoring of students' work. The observer commented:

> In math class Teacher AJ is up on her feet circulating almost constantly. She's not only available to talk to students who come to her; she goes around and makes a point of talking to them. Everyone in the class talks to her several times even if they don't approach her.

The observer also noted that in her math class Teacher AJ was, on the whole, "warm," "courteous," and "humanistic." The observer felt that the small class size encouraged and facilitated frequent, supportive teacher-student interaction.

Summary

The above discussion and the accompanying tables indicate that the activity structures of Teachers AD and AE were quite similar. The main difference was that Teacher AD allowed students to finish their class assignments at home while Teacher AE seldom extended that choice. However, student and teacher behavior and performance in each of the two classes differed greatly. Teacher AD's students seldom worked. To do so, they had to withdraw and ignore all the disruptions that were occurring around them. Few students were able to do this; most joined in the disruptions. In contrast, while Teacher AE's students considered their workload to be heavy, they managed to complete it. Further, while Teacher AE provided frequent feedback and assistance to the students, Teacher AD did not do so. Thus students complained that Teacher AD did not function as a teacher and did not deserve their cooperation. Conversely, students found Teacher AE "nice" and "fun," which, in their terms, described a teacher who helped them, listened to them, and kept them "in line" in a pleasant, supportive way.

Teacher AJ's class was a math fundamentals or remedial class, and thus had several differing features. First, there were only 15 students in the class, half the normal figure. Second, the content was even more basic than the other math classes, which repeated material most students had mastered in elementary school. Third, Teacher AJ had two student aides and used them to help monitor two of the three student groups. Only in this math class was use of small instructional groups a prominent feature of the activity structure.

Hence seventh-grade students had markedly different demands to be met, instructional experiences, and learning success, depending on the math teacher to whom they were assigned. The effects of these differences are discussed briefly in the summary and conclusions section of Chapter Two in this volume, and are considered in more detail in the student participation volume (see Volume IV).

History

History at Waverley was a required course for all seventh-grade students. The topic of study was world history. Observations were conducted in three teachers' classes: Teacher AB's second and fifth periods, Teacher AG's sixth period, and Teacher AJ's first, fifth, sixth, and seventh periods. As has been noted earlier, Teacher AB also was observed in her two English classes. In addition, Teacher AG was observed in one music class, and Teacher AJ was observed in her math fundamentals class. The structures of classes other than history classes are described elsewhere in this chapter. Descriptions of the teachers' world history structures follow.

Teacher AB

Students' experiences in Teacher AB's world history classes appeared to have been similar to those of her English classes. Comparison of the structure outlined in Table 4.7 and the one presented earlier in Table 4.2 supports this conslusion.

Table 4.7

Teacher AB's World History Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
World History Mesopotamia Egypt Greece Rome Map skills	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing, when and where to complete work - Order in which parts of assignment were done - (At times) selection of topic to study from teacher-suggested list	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic - private written comments	- Students could advance within assignments - Dependent on teacher to advance to new assignment

Teacher AB's history classes were properly titled "World History." During the nine weeks of observation, the course content focused on the development of Western man. The course began with the beginning of civilization in Mesopotamia and continued through study of the early Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans by mid-November.

Several types of assignments were given to the students. Like the other history teachers (see discussion that follows), Teacher AB used commercially prepared map worksheets. Each sheet included a map and a written passage related to the region portrayed in the map. Questions based on the written text required the students to use map-reading skills and to identify appropriate geographical locations related to data on historical events contained in the text. For example, during the study of the Greek-Persian wars, the students were given a map showing Greece, the Aegean Sea, various islands, and other relevant features of the region. Important cities during that period, such as Marathon, Athens, and Thermopylae were marked on the map by arrows and names. The accompanying text provided information about places where the Greeks won important battles and where the Persians defeated the Greeks. The land that belonged to Greece during the period 546-480 B.C. also was described. (It may be worth noting that the commercial text gave the false impression that "Greece" was a single political entity at that time rather than a number of independent states.) The students were to circle the places on the map where the various battles occurred and shade in the area that belonged to Greece. In addition to the commercially prepared maps, students sometimes were asked to copy maps from the textbook and insert approriate cities, travel routes, and other geographical features. Map assignments were given once or twice each week during the Fall Quarter.

Teacher AB also asked the students to complete short answer questions based on reading assigned in the world history textbook. These questions were assigned regularly and were to be answered as the class progressed through the text. To supplement the text, Teacher AB used materials prepared by the same publisher as the maps. These worksheets included one or two written paragraphs with questions. For example, one worksheet was headed, "Persian Wars: The Battle of Marathon." Five true-false questions were given, one of which stated, "The Greeks were greatly outnumbered at Marathon." Another worksheet was titled, "Persian Invasion: Thermopylae" and had questions asking the students to recall facts such as "the number of Spartans that died at Thermopylae." Not all worksheets included simple recall questions; for instance, one sheet asked the students to imagine they were petitioning the King of Sumer for solutions to the cities' difficulties. While the solutions were discussed in the text, the students were to develop their own rationales for why the solutions would resolve various problems.

In addition to the above written assignments, Teacher AB sometimes developed her own worksheets. One such sheet asked the students to define five terms -- AD, BC, decade, century, and turning point in history -- and included questions such as "What century would 490 B.C. be in?"

Teacher AB's weekly routine included a current events activity. Usually on Wednesdays, she played an audiotape recording of part of the nightly news presented on one of the television channels during the week. Teacher AB selected current topics that were pertinent to the area of the ancient world being studied at the time. News reports regarding the Iran-Iraq War and President Anwar Sadat illustrate the sort of subjects that were included. After listening to the audiotape, a class discussion was held and the students were given questions about the topic to answer in writing. On Fridays, a current events quiz was given. Generally, the questions on the quiz were similar to those included in the written assignment.

For the most part, assignments of the sort described above comprised the students' work for a given week. Occasionally, Teacher AB broke the routine. Once, students were required to make and illustrate a timeline of the history of Mesopotamia. Another time, they were asked to write newspaper articles describing historical events that occurred during the period being studied.

Teacher AB used only one instructional group. All students were expected to complete the same assignments. During the class, the students might read from the text (either aloud or to themselves), watch a film, or work on a map, depending on the assignment. At some point in most class periods, Teacher AB would lead the class in a discussion of the material covered in the assigned activities. The observer commented on these discussions, comparing class discussions held in early September to those conducted in late September:

> The teacher is carrying on more oral recitations [in late September]. However, the responses are still directed towards the teacher exclusively. There is no communication between the students on the work. It is all teacher-directed . . . The questions come from the teacher and the reponses are made to the teacher . . . However, the students seem more lively, more interested and are definitely participating more in the work now than they were at the beginning of the year.

There was no division of labor recorded by the observer. The students worked independently on their assignments. Students had control over several aspects of the activities. For example, the teacher handed them several parts of the assignment at once, with different due dates for various parts. The students had the opportunity to determine the order of completion and the amount of time to allot to to each part. At times, Teacher AB assigned projects in which the students could choose their project topics from a teacher-prepared list.

Generally, evaluation of academic achievement tended to be private and written. Evaluation of behavior was typically public and negative for purposes of discipline. Teacher AB had a reputation for being "strict," and used "plans" as a means of behavior control in this class, as she did in English. Students who disrupted the class

were required to write a "plan," which would outline in some fashion the steps the student would take to correct the objectionable behavior. The plan would then be signed by the student's parents and returned to Teacher AB.

Thus these classes were "all business," as were Teacher AB's English classes. The observer commented that the students had little time to get into trouble. The entire period was highly structured and organized, with much work to be done. Students commented that Teacher AB was a "hard" teacher, but they also felt she was accessible and willing to talk with and help them.

Teacher AG

Teacher AG taught one period of world history, two periods of seventh-grade music, and chorus, which included both seventh- and eighth-grade students. He was observed during his sixth-period history class and in one music period. This discussion reports on his history class.

All seventh-grade world history classes observed at Waverley emphasized the development of Western civilization. During the first three months of school, the curriculum focused on early Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. Teacher AG taught the history class as a single group (see Table 4.8). A typical day involved students reading from the textbook, followed by discussion of the information they had read. Discussions were in the form of dialogues between the teacher and the class. Teacher AG did not encourage students to interact with one another. Sometimes a film or map took the place of the text as the focus for discussion. Most class periods also allowed time to work on one or two assignment sheets.

Table 4.8

Teacher AG's World History Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
World History Mesopotamia Egypt Greece Rome	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Where to complete assignments, e.g., in class or at home	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic - private, usually written	- Dependent on teacher to move to new assignment - Not dependent on teacher to advance within assignments

In a self-report, Teacher AG stated that his goals in world history were:

1. to give students a basic understanding of history from the Sumerians to the current time, including a chronology of events and developments.

2. to have students understand historiography and cause and effects in man's past.

3. to familiarize students with historical observation, using past events and their causes.

4. to stimulate students to pursue historical and current event observations on their own.

5. to help students recognize that (a) history is comprised not only of events but also the creative works of others and themselves; (b) the world of today is interrelated with the past, present and future; and (c) relationships exist between past events and man's accomplishments across the ages.

To accomplish these objectives, Teacher AG used map work, reading assignments, recitations, and various kinds of worksheets.

An assignment related to a map of Africa illustrates the type of map work that was done. This required the students to read some written material regarding Africa, locate the main rivers and bodies of water on the map, and answer questions such as "What is Africa's largest lake?" and "Name the rivers that flow into the Atlantic Ocean."

Teacher AG frequently used commercially prepared worksheets that accompanied the textbook, Rise of the West. After reading a specified portion of the text, the students were to answer questions that required them to recall facts presented in the text. As noted in the description of Teacher AB's World History content, these worksheets included true-false questions, e.g., "A teenager is living in 3175 A.D. To him, the year 1976 A.D. seems ancient; true or false?" Sometimes, when a statement was marked false, the students were to change the word, or words, written in italics, to make it a true statement. For example, in the statement, "All Sumerians could read and write," "all" would be changed if the statement were marked false. Occasionally, the questions required more complex responses. One exercise asked the students to speculate how lower taxes, avoidance of war, and unification of the cities of Sumer might have benefited the people of Sumer. Other worksheets required the students to read graphs and respond to questions such as "Which are the two hottest months in Mesopotamia?" and "Compare the population of cities in the Roman Empire with those cities today." Generally, however, these daily exercises stressed recall or information contained in the text or in the worksheet itself.

Use of higher cognitive skills was rarely demanded and students seldom had to respond by writing complete sentences or paragraphs.

Students worked independently on their assignments. No examples of students working together to complete a single activity were recorded in the observer narratives. The only control the students had over their work was the opportunity to complete their assignments at home. While the students were permitted to advance through an activity without checking with the teacher, approval was required to move on to the next task. In fact, Teacher AG's world history structure was one of the most tightly controlled and teacher-centered activity structures observed at Waverley.

Evaluation focussed on both students' in-class behavior and their academic performances. Behavior control was frequent, public, and generally negative. Students were expected to stay on task, not talk to one another, and raise their hands if they needed help from the teacher. For the most part, academic performance was evaluated privately by Teacher AG in comments written on assignments, tests, worksheets, and report cards.

In the October and November student interviews, the focus was primarily on their English and mathematics classes. Thus students' comments about their world history classes usually were spontaneous, unsolicted remarks. Several students offered such comments about Teacher AG. Student A22 attributed Teacher AG's success at discipline to his teaching ability:

> Like when he talks, he knows what he's talking about. He explains it real clear and makes it kind of better for us to understand, better than sittin' there talk'n, talk'n. Makes it kinda fun.

Student A24 also noted that Teacher AG's discipline was effective, but for different reasons than those offered by Student A22:

> Teacher AG doesn't give you a chance to do anything. He stands up in front of the class all the time and talks. He can see everything that is going on. When someone talks, he will write their name on the board or something. When he goes behind the class, we are usually reading out loud, so you don't really have a chance to do anything in his class.

Student A24 further explained Teacher AG's behavior-control techniques:

> Interviewer: What do teachers do this year if you are talking out loud?
>
> Student A24: Well, Teacher AG writes your name on the board. If he puts a check

> next to it, it means you have a detention. Two checks, you go see the asssistant principal. Three checks, is a detention and the assistant principal.

Teacher AG's clear and consistent discipline policy appeared to discourage misbehavior by all but the most foolhardy, as Student A7 emphasized:

> If you're still talking, you know, he'll put a check by your name and that'll be 15 minutes after [school]. Then if you're really stupid and you're not looking up there and you're just babbling your head off, you get to see the assistant principal.

Some of the students' attention to assigned tasks also may have resulted from Teacher AG's willingness to help students who needed assistance. Student A24 explained:

> You raise your hand, and he will come over to you and [you] ask him how to do this, or [say] I don't understand something. Then he will help you and tell you what it means and sometimes give answers.

Obviously, the organization and interactions in this class made an impact on the students, given the number of unsolicited and unprompted comments made during the interviews. The observer felt the teacher and the students respected each other. Student A7 referred to Teacher AG as his "buddy" and indicated he enjoyed talking to him after school. Hence, again, the students appeared both to respect and like the teacher and to function well in a class where the teacher was clear about what was to be done, explained this well to the students, established clear rules for classroom participation and enforced them, but, in addition, also was readily available to help the students when they had problems. This help took many forms in Teacher AG's history class, including supportive feedback, further explanation of an assignment, response to a specific question, and, at times, provision of the answer to a question or problem. Evidently the "strict" teachers who also performed in the above manner were respected and liked by the students and students managed to complete the assignments they were given in these classes as well.

Teacher AJ

Teacher AJ taught four periods of world history and was observed in each of them. Her other class was math fundamentals, which was described earlier in this chapter. In the four history classes, Teacher AJ did not vary her activity structure. The observer noted some of the consequences of this practice for Teacher AJ:

> She has three history classes in a row in the afternoon when the students come back from lunch. They've all eaten a lot of sugar, they're restless because they want to see their friends and be out playing. Her energy definitely changes as the classes change. Fifth period is okay. By sixth period, she appears to hit a slump which she says is because she knows she is going to have to do it again. We talked about this and she commented that this was difficult for her to handle. Seventh period actually is a little easier than sixth period because she knows it is the last. [As the day goes on] she says less and less to her classes. She explains less and less. Her enthusiasm for sharing is less. She is involved with the students less.

Teacher AJ's world history course also proceeded from Mesopotamia through the early Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans by the end of the period of observation, which was eleven weeks from the beginning of the school year. She said one of her goals was to help the students "to understand the people of these ancient civilizations and why the civilizations failed to survive."

In organizing her classroom (see Table 4.9), Teacher AJ used one instructional group, except for a few brief tasks. For example, she sometimes formed the rows of students into teams for short question-and-answer contests based on the academic material. Once she had small groups work together to prepare a timeline.

Table 4.9

Teacher AJ's World History Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
World History Mesopotamia Egypt Greece Rome Map Skills	- Whole group, except for a few brief tasks	- Little division of labor, a few times students formed teams for quizzes or to do brief projects	- Pacing of time spent doing various tasks - Number of assignments to complete to earn specific grade	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic, private, written comments or grades on assignments	- Students move through units independent of teacher - Dependent on teacher to move to new unit

Two approaches to instruction dominated. First, there was teacher-led instruction, which might be a teacher-directed question-and-answer session, students reading aloud from the textbook, or teacher-directed correction of previous work. Alternatively, the teacher allowed one or two work periods per week when the students could work on their assignments individually at their seats.

Assignments were organized by units (e.g., Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome). That is, there were a batch of assignments for each topic of study, including reading, vocabulary, content questions, commercially prepared worksheets, and map work. The teacher presented the assignments early in the study of a unit, and then allowed several days or weeks to complete them, thus providing students control over the order and the amount of time spent on each. The teacher extended a large amount of control over the number of assignments a student needed to complete. She linked the number of assignments students must complete to the grade they wished to achieve. A student wishing to earn a "D" had to complete a comparatively minimal amount of work, while a student wishing an "A" had to do appreciably more.

Thus students could choose the maximum grade they would work for in the course.

Student A27, who had straight "A's" the first quarter, commented on the grading system:

> I think it's a pretty good way to grade. See, she tells you what you can go for: an "A," "B," "C," or "D" . . . and you have to do certain things for that grade. If you do them all well [you get a good grade]. If you don't turn in one assignment, your grade goes down. I like it; it's different than what all my other teachers have done.

For the first two weeks of school, Teacher AJ stressed map skills. The students brought road maps from home and after discussing them as a group answered questions such as "What is included in the legend?" and "What city is located in the uppermost NW section of the map?" In addition, Teacher AJ used commercially prepared map worksheets that introduced the students to contour maps and computation of mileage using a mileage scale.

Maps also played a part in the study of the ancient civilizations. To receive a "C" grade for the first quarter, students were required to complete a "Review Quiz Map." Using a commercially prepared map, the students were to place the names of 11 "peoples, rivers, or cities" on a map of Mesopotamia. To receive a "B" grade, students were to do a similar map exercise for Assyria. Students wishing an "A" could do either map, but preferably both. Students satisfied with a "D" grade had no map assignment. Presumably, similar review maps also were assigned in the Egyptian, Greece, and Roman units.

Teacher AJ used the same commercial worksheets that accompanied the textbook Rise of the West that were used by Teachers AB and AG. Since these already have been described in the discussions of Teacher AB's and Teacher AG's activity structures, the information will not be repeated here. In addition, Teacher AJ prepared some worksheets. One such sheet included 11 vocabulary words, such as cuneiform, empire, merchants, and barbarians. The number of words to be defined depended on the grade the student wished to receive. Short answer questions also were given; for example, "What was Sumer?" and "Who was Ibbisin?" Some questions were more complex, such as "Why were canals important to early civilizations?" and "What was the value of a united empire?" Again, the number of questions answered was linked to the grade to be received.

Other types of activities were included in some assignments. A timeline, outlines of Teacher AJ's lectures, bringing objects from home that might be of interest to archeologists who investigated today's culture several hundred years in the future, cooking one or more ancient mid-eastern foods at home, building pyramids from sugar cubes, and designing record album covers and writing song lyrics representative of the ancient civilizations were among the activities students could do to earn higher grades. Throughout, earning an "honor grade" required the students to do a larger quantity of work than other students. However, the cognitive difficulty of this extra work did not appear to be greater than that included in the assignments required of students who wished to earn at least a "C" grade.

Teacher AJ usually did not evaluate academic performance publicly, preferring, instead, written comments and grades on corrected papers, as illustrated by this excerpt from an interview with Student A10:

Interviewer: Does she ever talk to you about your papers?

Student A10: No.

Interviewer: Does she hand them back?

Student A10: Yes.

Interviewer: And then you can tell how you've done?

Student A10: She has a grade on it and how many it is.

Students frequently stated that Teacher AJ's class was "hard." Student A22 said that Teacher AJ gave "the most work" of any of her teachers. Student A23 said he worked "harder" in this class and that there was "a lot" of work. Student A21 said she worked "hard" in history and, given that she typically spent more time talking than working in her classes, the following excerpt is noteworthy:

Interviewer: Is there something special about the teacher so that you want to work hard in the class?

Student A21: Yeah. She's nice.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about her being nice?

Student A21: If I like the class, I work hard. They give you, you know, I don't know how to put it. Just confidence, I guess, that makes you want to work, you know? I know I can get good grades if I really try.

Teacher AJ had a reputation for being a strict teacher. Student A23 commented, "She don't mess around," meaning she was serious about about managing students' behavior. The observer said:

> The students are not allowed to be late to class. She gives detentions for this. There is no gum-chewing or eating allowed in class. She also gives a detention for this. There is no combing or brushing of hair during class, and if she sees anyone doing that, she confiscates the brush or comb until class is over. There is no drinking water during class. She gives detentions for this.

The observer felt these rules were enforced in an even-handed, impartial manner:

> The law was the law, and on more than one occasion I saw students break down in tears because they were given a detention for drinking water during class. Her manner was very strict. She didn't make an attempt to explain her rules when punishing.

However, students apparently did not feel these behavior-control issues were as salient as the hard work. Only one target student offered negative remarks about Teacher AJ's rules or discipline.

On the whole, the students liked Teacher AJ. Of the eight students who commented on Teacher AJ, four called her "nice" or "fun," which, for these students, were terms of praise. Another student, Student A27, said she "liked" the grading system. Aside from the necessity to work hard, no student had anything to say about Teacher AJ and her class that might be interpreted as negative.

Teacher AJ, then, conducted a firmly disciplined history class. The delivery of instruction was teacher-centered, although Teacher

AJ extended the students significant control over the amount of work they did. Students found the class and the teacher "strict," "hard," and "nice." Further, observations focusing on the target students indicated that Teacher AJ was accessible to the students for help and assistance. Although she did not move around to help the students as much in this class as she did in her math fundamentals class, Teacher AJ quickly went to students when they raised their hands for help during the work periods or assisted them when they sought her out at her desk or came in after school.

Summary

The seventh-grade history experience at Waverley across the three teachers observed presented more similarities than differences. The content was the same in each class, as was the grouping. For the most part, no division of labor was observed. Students independently completed the same assignments within a particular class, although the nature of the assignments differed among the classes. Further, in Teacher AG's class, some division of labor might have occurred when the students selected topics for their projects, and in Teacher AJ's class the amount of work done to earn a particular grade may have encouraged some division of labor across the students. Teachers AB and AJ favored distribution of "units," or several assignments at once, thus extending to the students control over time, the order of task completion, and selection of school or home as the place where the work would be done. Teacher AG favored assignments due the next day or the same period. Interestingly, all three teachers were termed "strict" by their students, although only Teacher AB was felt to be unfair by any of the students. Teacher AB used a "plan" as a behavior-control device. Some students did not consider her distribution of plans to be based on an appropriate assessment of misbehavior. All the teachers offered feedback and assistance to the students on an individual as well as a group basis.

Reading

In addition to the required English class, seventh-grade students at Waverley were allowed to elect either a reading skills class or a foreign language class (French, Spanish, or German). According to some seventh-grade teachers, successful students tended to select a foreign language while less successful students favored reading skills. Thus teachers felt the reading skills classes had a proportionately larger number of low achievers than did the other courses. Observations were conducted in two teachers' reading skills classes, Teacher AH and Teacher AI. Of the 24 target students in the transition study, 12 elected to take reading skills. Four were observed in these classes. Data regarding the teachers are based on observations in the class periods in which these four students were enrolled.

Teacher AH

Teacher AH taught four sections of seventh-grade reading and one section of eighth-grade English. He had two main goals for his reading students. First, he intended to raise the level of their reading proficiency to "the same level of classes in other years." Second, he stressed learning skills. He noted:

> I'm not just focusing on reading skills. My primary focus is basically on learning skills -- organizing the time, using the time efficiently, knowing what's going on, and what goes where. Within this pattern, the successful student is going to be able to work things through, be able to attend to the task at hand.

His activity structure, discussed in the following paragraphs and summarized in Table 4.10, suggests the extent to which Teacher AH put these goals into practice.

Table 4.10

Teacher AH's Reading Skills Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading Skills Speed Reading Vocabulary Listening Use of the Dictionary	- Five groups based on ability	- No division of labor within groups - Students using equipment must cooperate in its operation	- No student control on regular assignments - Could choose whether to do extra credit - Could choose material for free reading and book for book report - Pacing of work on total class vocabulary assignment up to student	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic - private, written comments and grades on papers and report card	- Dependent on group members and equipment when using reading machine or records - Dependent on teacher to move to new task or new assignment

During the second week of school, Teacher AH divided each class into five groups of five or six students each. These were ability-level groups, formed by students' performance on teacher-selected tests given during the first week of school and the achievement tests given at the end of the sixth grade. During the first four days of each succeeding week, these groups rotated through a series of four tasks. Assignments were keyed to the reading level of the groups, so various groups had different assignments within each major task.

The first task centered on a guided reading machine, which projected text onto a screen at a rate controlled by the teacher. This exercise took the same form each week. First, the group read a story, the first half from their reader and the second half from the machine. When they had read the story, the students answered comprehension questions that generally required recall of facts presented in the material that had just been read. For example, one question asked, "Henry got a job working with (a) coal, (b) steel, (c) plastics." The questions were listed in the reader. The goal of this exercise was to increase speed, primarily, but also to improve comprehension. Each of the five groups in the class was assigned this task once each week. The difficulty of the reading material varied across groups.

The second task involved vocabulary. Each group listened to a tape-recorded statement that introduced and drilled the students on the meaning and use of vocabulary words. Written exercises, varying by ability of the group, accompanied these cassette recordings. This task followed the same format each week.

The third task was a listening task involving a cassette recording of science or social studies technical material. The students listened to the recording while following the text in a book. After the tape was finished, they answered questions that focused on the students' comprehension of what they had heard (and read). Again the task was similar from week to week and comprised fact-recall questions that were of a true-false or check-the-right-answer type.

The fourth task, which was a commercially prepared vocabulary worksheet, was passed out on Monday and was due on Friday. Typical of these worksheets was a lesson concerning compound words, in which students were to select two words from a list and join them together to make a new word that matched a definition given on the worksheet. Depending on the rotating schedule for the other three tasks, one of the four days was reserved for this assignment. The assignment also could be completed at home, leaving the students with more "free" time for other reading or academic activities during regular classtime. Hence the students in the gorup could also read a book, magazine, or comic or work on extra-credit material during this period. Still more additional time was allocated for completing this worksheet on Friday afternoons, after the critical reading skills lesson.

On Friday, the class met as a single group to work on various "critical reading skills," in order to recognize and understand such writing genres as propaganda or advertising. For instance, one week an advertisement for a camera was distributed to to the students. They were to indicate what information they would want to know about the camera and whether the information was or was not included in the ad. When the critical reading exercise was completed, the students had independent time, which could be used for reading, completing the week's work, or doing extra-credit work. To provide extra exposure to written material, Teacher AH had a large number of extra credit assignments, such as crossword puzzles, word-search games, and other material of a similar nature. Completion of this work improved a student's chance of obtaining an "A" or "B" grade.

Thus, on any one of the first four days of the week, an observer would find one or two groups of students at work with the speed-reading machine, one group with a cassette recorder and the vocabulary exercise, and another group with a cassette recorder and the listening exercise. Remaining group(s) would be involved in the independent work, such as the total-class vocabulary assignment, extra-credit assignments, or free reading. On Friday the whole class worked together. In addition to the above tasks and activities, the students were required to complete a book report once a month.

Teacher AH purposefully organized the class into groups that followed repetitive routines. He stated:

> I establish a routine so that students really know that they go into the same place in the room at the same time and that the same assignment is going to be due in a certain place at a certain time. In establishing these kinds of routines, my goal is to have students realize that routines are ends in themselves and can be a help in accomplishing goals of their own, particularly goals related to school work.

Within the above content and group structure, there were no instances observed of students being required to work together to produce one product. In all cases we observed, the students were responsible for their own products. They did have to cooperate in the operation of equipment, however.

Students had control in two areas: pacing and activities. In pacing there was control over when to do the class-wide vocabulary sheet, which was handed out on Monday and due Friday (see previous discussion). Also, the students could do the extra credit work, if they elected to do it, at a time of their own choosing. If a student chose to work for an honor grade, it was necessary to complete the extra credit work at some time during the week. Thus there were some choices related to various activities and, in terms of extra credit work, whether to do it in order to earn a higher grade.

During independent reading time, the students could choose to read any of the materials available in the room: books, magazines, and comics ("for those in an intellectual frame of mind" as the teacher ironically put it). They also were free to bring their own books. For their monthly book report they could read any book they chose.

Students' ability to advance without consent of others varied, according to the activity underway. When they were working at the cassettes or the speed-reading machine, the students were naturally limited to the rate of advancement dictated by the speed of the equipment; also, they were dependent on the cooperation of their peers for the smooth operation of the equipment. To illustrate, the student case descriptions include incidents of Students A5 and A8 varying the volumes of the tapes and quarreling with each other over operation of the cassette recorder.

On Fridays, after the group lesson, when the students were either completing the week's work or doing independent reading, they might advance without teacher-imposed restraint.

Students said little about this class during their interviews. (While we specifically asked the students about their math and English classes, comments about reading were spontaneous.) Two students reported that the class was too easy. Student A5 said reading was "easier" than his other classes. Student A13 felt quite strongly:

> Well, I got Teacher AH, and first I had Teacher AI, but they transferred me 'cause she was too easy. Now I'm in Teacher AH's, but he's way too easy, too. It's not even a challenge.

After a request from this student's mother, Teacher AH moved Student A13 into a higher group.

Academic evaluation in this class centered on the grades and comments written on the students' work. No oral evaluations of students' academic work were recorded in the observation narratives. Most daily work the students did was self-corrected and later reviewed by the teacher. The weekly vocabulary exercises were corrected and returned by the teacher during the following week. The major evaluations of academic progress were deficiency notes sent home for students who were in danger of receiving a "D" or "F" on their report cards, which were distributed four times a year. In addition to written grades and comments, students also obtained a less formal type of academic evaluation by asking the teacher questions about their work. Teacher AH also might comment on their work as he moved around and monitored the individual students at their seats.

Teacher AH's oral, whole-class evaluations overwhelmingly involved behavior control and were negative. They were directed either at individuals or, less often, at one of the groups. Teacher AH's evaluations of behavior were characterized by three approaches: (1) a formal, rhetorical question or statement that indirectly suggested a change of behavior was necessary; (2) an imperative designed to immediately redirect specific student behavior; or (3) an emphatic reference to the consequences accompanying certain behavior. Teacher AH refrained from mentioning his own feelings or reactions to students' behavior in his reprimands, and seldom described the consequences, should the misbehavior continue.

According to the observers, Teacher AH "seldom tried to relate with his students on a one-to-one basis," nor did he "lecture or teach the class." This distant demeanor was symbolized by his habit of wearing dark sunglasses in the classroom. The sunglasses appeared to inadvertently reinforce his remoteness, as they precluded any possibility of eye contact with his students.

Teacher AH also had a habit of turning on a portable radio after the five-minute "warning" bell rang at the end of each period, prompting opposite reactions from the two observers who witnessed

this behavior. The first observer felt that the act represented a withdrawal from classroom activities in that the radio diverted Teacher AH's entire attention away from the students. The other observer, however, felt that the turning on of the radio (especially when the broadcast consisted of popular music or the World Series) was an attempt to "reach out to the students," and was designed to establish more intimacy or commaraderie between Teacher AH and his students.

The apparent lack of informal interaction between Teacher AH and his students did not appear to affect Teacher AH's interest in teaching reading skills. On the contrary, one observer noted, "He considers his subject to be very important and hopes to do his thesis for an M.A. on reading."

In conclusion, the two observers felt Teacher AH communicated an air of purposefulness, organization, and concern to his students, regarding the work to be done. He did not communicate interest in, or warmth toward, individual students.

Teacher AI

Teacher AI was observed during her sixth-period reading skills class. The lessons included vocabulary and spelling, as well as the various skills associated with reading. As noted in Table 4.11, the students were generally taught as a single group, although commercially prepared reading kits were assigned to individual students according to reading ability. Students worked independently on their assignments. No division of labor, requiring students to work with one another, was noted. The only control Teacher AI extended to the students was the choice between either 10 or 20 vocabulary words to assimilate each week. Vocabulary tests were given once a week. Teacher AI orally defined each word for the entire class. The students then chose the appropriate word from a list on the chalkboard. Examples of words assigned during the observation period included "lagoon," "enormous," and "piranha." Teacher AI gave the definition for all 20 words, and students responded to either 10 or 20 of them, depending on the vocabulary option they had taken for the week.

Assignments were typically due the same day they were distributed, but within the assignment the students were free to move ahead at their own speeds, with the obvious exception of the spelling and vocabulary tests.

Teacher AI evaluated academic work privately, through comments or grades on corrected assignments or report cards. Evaluation of behavior was public and negative.

Two students volunteered comments regarding Teacher AI during their November interviews. Both felt she dealt with misbehavior in a strict fashion. Student A22 commented:

> She says, "Sit back down or I'll send you out. The principal told me to send you out."

Table 4.11

Teacher AI's Reading Skills Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Reading Skills Vocabulary Spelling Decoding Comprehension	- Whole groups - Some work individualized based on reading skills kit	- No division of labor	- Choice of 10 or 20 vocabulary words	- Behavior - public and negative - Academic - private, written grades and comments on assignments and report cards	- Dependent on teacher to advance to new assignment - Independent to advance within assignments

> If kids do it [misbehave] more than three times, she sends them out. It's an automatic referral so your grade goes down.

Student A15 agreed in this assessment:

> Teacher AI doesn't yell, but she goes angrily to her desk, grabs out a piece of paper, writes something down and sends the students out.

The observer also noted that Teacher AI used the expression "I don't care" repeatedly. During one class period the observer reported that Teacher AI "must have said the phrase 'I don't care' in three or four contexts." This apparent lack of interest in students' needs is illustrated in the following excerpt from the observer's narrative. The teacher and the observer were talking while the students were working on an assignment:

> The teacher gives no comment to those pupils who look expectantly at her with their hands raised. Nothing such as a request to wait. She just ignores them.

Such indifference appeared to confuse Teacher AI's students, as this excerpt from the observer's descriptions suggests:

> The students have stopped making circles up at their temples to say that she is crazy, but the class is not a happy, cohesive one. She doesn't draw it together. If anything, it draws together against her.

Thus, from the interviews and the narrative protocols, the sense emerged that Teacher AI communicated an air of indifference about her subject to her students.

Summary

Teachers AH and AI taught the reading skills classes differently. Teacher AH appeared to provide a more structured and diversified instructional program than Teacher AI. Further, Teacher AH used small groups, while Teacher AI worked with the entire class much of the time. Both teachers were judged by the observers to be formal with the students; neither provided much feedback and assistance. Several students commented that the reading skills classes, regardless of which teacher taught them, were too easy.

Block

The arts and crafts program for seventh-graders at Waverley was called "block," a series of introductory courses in art, music, home economics, and wood shop that together constituted one subject of the seventh-grade curriculum. Each course lasted nine weeks (one quarter of the year). The students rotated through the block during the course of the year. Boys and girls were enrolled together in all the classes, including wood shop and home economics. A few students who took band or chorus elected not to enroll in the block courses.

Three teachers who taught block classes were observed. One was Teacher AF, who taught only the art classes. Another was Teacher AG, who taught the music classes. (Teacher AG also taught world history. The manner in which he organized his world history class already has been described.) Finally, Teacher AK, who taught home economics, was observed. No observations were conducted in wood shop, the fourth block class, because the target students were not enrolled in this class until the second quarter of the school year. Descriptions of the three teacher's classes follow, beginning with Teacher AF.

Teacher AF: Art

Teacher AF had taught at Waverley for 24 years and was the chairman of the Arts Department. He taught art to seventh-graders, and art, filmmaking, and photography to eighth-graders. During the transition study, he was observed in his third-period art class.

Teacher AF's classes were observed on ten days during September. When the observers returned in November, the group of students being observed had moved on to the next segment of the block, so no further observations were conducted in the art classes.

Teacher AF reported that he expected the students to have little or no training or background in art prior to entering his seventh-grade class. He stated he had three goals, given the general level of artistic knowledge and ability in the class. First, he aspired "to develop an awareness of and interest in aesthetics in terms of their everyday living," and hoped "that by the end of the quarter most of them will be sensitive to textures, shapes and colors." His

second goal was "to teach a few basic skills, such as lettering, color mixing, cutting, gluing, and some concept of design." Third, he attempted to make his class a "pleasant, fun experience for the students."

To implement these goals, Teacher AF assigned the students projects. The first project of the year involved lettering. The students were to print the alphabet on white paper with a soft pencil, using guidelines. Besides the alphabet, they were to practice writing words. When the teacher had approved their lettering, they were to select several words that were to be written out in such a way so as to create a graphic design denoting the meaning of the word. For example, students printed words such as "double vision," "hook," "snatch," and "shoe."

The second project involved using tissue paper, crayon, and pig fat to make a picture. The pig fat served as the medium attaching the tissue to the paper. Other projects involved copper tooling and printmaking. The final, and main, project was the design and manufacture of a Halloween mask.

Teacher AF's assignments required little or no reading, composition, or oral expression. Teacher AF taught the class as a whole group, as noted in the table below.

Table 4.12

Teacher AF's Art Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Art Aesthetics in terms of texture, shape, color Skills -- lettering, color mixing, cutting, gluing, Design concepts	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Pacing, some within time limit specified for projects - Talking and movement as long as others were not disturbed or disrupted	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic, some public, group discussion of quality of students' work. Mostly private oral or written comments. Both positive and negative	- Dependent on teacher to advance both within projects and to new projects

No division of labor was observed. Generally, students worked alone; although at the start of the semester Teacher AF encouraged the students to help each other by advising and commenting on each other's work. Students received grades on their final products. There were no joint projects.

On the face of it, one could argue that art might provide students with considerable control over content and procedures, since options exist in choice of color, subject design, and so forth. However, these options were restricted by Teacher AF. As already noted, during the lettering exercise, the type of paper and pencil, as well as the use of lettering guidelines, was predefined by the teacher. During the tissue paper project, Teacher AF required the picture to be positioned vertically on the paper. In this fashion, he restricted students' control of most projects' form and content.

However, Teacher AF extended some control in the area of pacing. While he set a due date for each project, students could finish at any time before then. The students worked on sketches of their projects and, when the sketch was finished, presented it for approval to Teacher AF. If the project was completed before the due date, the teacher usually had other extra projects -- for example, a poster the student government required for the Halloween dance -- to be done.

Teacher AF's rules governing class decorum allowed more latitude than in most other classes observed at Waverley. For example, he informed students on the first day:

> In the art room there is more mobility than in other rooms. We move around the room. If you want to get a pencil, you get a pencil. You go to the locker. You wash your hands.

Talking, too, was legitimate for work purposes:

> Talking is okay when you are working. If I find you talking about last night's date and no work getting done, then I shall be unhappy.

The important distinction here is Teacher AF allowed movement and talking when they were not disruptive, while most other teachers explicitly disallowed them, although, for both, some tacit tolerance was observed in most classes, in varying degrees.

Teacher AF discussed with the researchers the principles he used for evaluation. He said he expected his students "to see and feel their environment with greater depth and intensity and to utilize more imaginacion and to express themselves with greater creativity than when they first entered the class." He judged whether such growth had occurred by examining their projects. He looked for a "sense of pride and creative satisfaction" on the part of the students, manifesting itself in the form of a desire to share projects with others.

In discussing his grades he noted "I expect most students in this class to receive 'A's' and 'B's' for their final grade." He gave "C's" and "D's" " . . . only when the students obviously pushed out their projects simply to get them over with." He said he gave failing grades to students who made no effort to complete projects.

In discussing deportment, Teacher AF told his students he expected them to be silent when he was talking, to follow his directions, and to speak courteously to him. When interacting with each other, he told them to eschew hazing, teasing, and other forms of bad manners and that he expected them to have a "positive, friendly, and helpful attitude toward each other."

Evaluation was based on the above criteria. For example, on the first Friday of the school year, Teacher AF publicly evaluated the class's work, pointing out that the guidelines for the letters were neither straight nor parallel, but had a "roller coaster" effect. He also criticized the students for not drawing their letters so they touched the guidelines. While this evaluation tended to be negative, he also evaluated the class positively, saying, "Most of you are trying and working hard."

Academic evaluations of students' projects were conducted privately. Students brought their projects up to him to be evaluated two times for each assignment. First, they showed the teacher their preliminary sketches. He either approved them or asked the students to develop the drawings further. For example, the observer noted:

> Teacher AF is looking at Student A8's paper and pointing to one word design. He says, "That one is pretty good, why don't you work on that?"

Teacher AF also used these opportunities to make suggestions on various aspects of the work. When the students finished their projects, they presented them for a grade, which Teacher AF wrote on the back of the paper.

Teacher AF usually evaluated students' social behavior publicly and negatively. Most often he reprimanded students for talking or otherwise disrupting him when he was talking. For example, he told the class, "You're too noisy to listen to instructions." On another day he rebuked two noisy students publicly, saying, "Hey, shut up! When I'm talking, I want you to hear it." Other public, negative evaluations of individual behavior included a remark to a student who was chewing gum: "I chew gum, too but I don't blow bubbles."

There also were reprimands for unsafe acts, off-task behavior, and procedures violations. For example, he sanctioned Student A8 for wasting time and not working:

> Mr. A8, I know that you are exhausted from writing one word this period, but could you try two?

Sanctions for violating procedural rules such as not returning to one's seat, putting materials away, etc., occurred only during the first week of school. After that Teacher AF was not observed reprimanding students for such infractions, which occurred infrequently.

Evaluation, then, was generally public and negative when concerned with behavior and directed to the entire class and to individuals as

well. When evaluating academic performance, Teacher AF generally used both positive and negative comments, which were made privately. At times, he also would provide whole-class, public evaluations of the outcomes of a particular assignment.

Several features of the art classes were more or less unique and distinguished them from other subject-area classes. There was little recitation in these classes, for instance, and the students rarely listened to Teacher AF lecture or lead a class discussion. As noted earlier, there was little emphasis on reading, composition, and oral language. Instead, the predominant portion of the period was devoted to students working on their projects. Teacher AF's tolerance of social interaction -- a rare phenomenon in the other classes that were observed -- proved to be of significant importance to the students in the completion of tasks and activities in this class. Teacher AF told the students that he did not object to talking or movement around the room, as long as such behavior did not disrupt the progress of anyone's work.

Thus Teacher AF emphasized doing art rather than reading and talking about it. He set up an activity structure that had sufficient freedom to allow students to move about, talk with one another, and find art "a pleasant, fun experience." He provided frequent feedback and encouragement to the students as illustrated by this final excerpt from the observer narratives:

> Student A10 shows Teacher AF the completed design.
> Teacher AF says, "Good!"
> Student A10 says, "Can I start another one?"
> Teacher AF says, "By all means!"

Teacher AG: Music

Teacher AG taught two seventh-grade music classes. He was observed during the second-period class. As Teacher AG's discipline tactics were the same in both his music and history classes, and because the data on student opinions about his classes give us little reason to feel the students felt differently about him in the two subjects, this discussion provides only a brief review of the structure as it functioned in the music classes.

Teacher AG's music class was an introduction to the theory and history of music, rather than an introduction to the making of music. Topics covered during observation included introduction to the science of sound, the reading and writing of music, and the meaning of terms such as melody and rhythm. Sometimes Teacher AG illustrated his lesson by playing the guitar or piano. It is worth noting that no singing, playing of instruments, or listening to music, except for the guitar or piano demonstrations, was observed to take place in this music class.

Teacher AG employed a recitation and seatwork format. Usually the class period contained several episodes. First, the teacher led a recitation about one of the topics listed above. Second, a class assignment concerning that topic was given and students completed it as seatwork. Sometimes this sequence would be repeated, or one part would be repeated. Student participation involved reading from a book, responding to the teacher's questions, and writing answers to questions that were listed on worksheets or on the board. For the most part, the questions to which the students responded, orally or in writing, were fact-recall questions, based on information presented in the music text. Sample questions include "What three substances can sound travel through?" and "The greater the _____, the louder the sound will be," and "Define 'pitch.'" Music reading exercises required the students to name the notes, rests, and other information contained on a sheet of music. Other times, Teacher AG named various notes (e.g., B, A, B, and E), and the students drew the notes on a music staff, or, conversely, the students were given staffs on which notes were printed and were required to write the name of each note.

Teacher AG treated the class as one instructional group (see Table 4.13). The only control the teacher allowed the students was the frequent option of finishing seatwork at home.

Table 4.13

Teacher AG's Music Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Music Theory and history of music including: -science of sound -reading and writing of music -music vocabulary	- Whole group	- No division of labor	- Option to complete seatwork at home	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic - private, written comments	- Dependent on teacher to advance

Teacher AG established rules regarding no talking or moving about the room and sanctioned students publicly whenever he observed either occurring. Students commented on how many digressions he observed. Academic performance typically was private, in the form of written comments or grades on assignments and report cards.

The most striking feature of this class, compared with the other block classes, was the emphasis on talking and reading about music rather than performing music or becoming involved in listening and responding to others' performances. For the students in this portion of the block sequence, the class was structured like their English, history, and math classes. Music offered no variation in the activity structure demands to which they had to respond.

Teacher AK: Home Economics

Teacher AK taught the home economics portion of the block program. She was observed in her second- and third-period classes.

During the period of observation, Teacher AK covered three content areas. First, she oriented the students to cooking. This included teaching the names and uses of various cooking tools, which was carried out through recitations. Teacher AK held up and named each tool and asked the students "What is this used for?" Equivalent measures were taught using a worksheet on which a list was written of equivalents, such as 3 teaspoons equal 1 tablespoon. Students' knowledge of the various equivalents was tested several days following class discussion of the worksheet. Safety rules also were presented. A true-false test was given, checking on students' memorization of rules such as "Wipe up any spilled food or liquid immediately." This same test also asked the students to identify the various cooking tools and state their uses.

The second content area covered in the home economics class was the food groups. For this part of the curriculum, Teacher AK distributed a pamphlet that illustrated the various groups, e.g., grains and cereals, fruits and vegetables, and meats. Teacher AK discussed the food groups with the students, had them answer questions in the pamphlet, and had them draw pictures showing samples of foods in the various groups and their "favorite foods."

Cooking was the third activity included in the course. Three cooking assignments were observed. Several more occurred during the Fall Quarter. At the end of the second week of the school year, the students made cookies. Teacher AK prepared the batter, demonstrating in front of the class. The students placed the cookies on the cooking sheets and baked them. At the end of the cooking period, Teacher AK distributed a list of questions the students were to answer regarding the exercise. Questions included items such as "What utensil did the teacher use to measure: water? flour?" and "How did she make sure the measurement was exact?"

The second cooking assignment that was observed was biscuit making. Here the students performed all the cooking steps, including measuring and mixing the ingredients. While the biscuits baked, each student completed a "duty sheet" on which he or she described what each member of the cooking group did to contribute to the preparation of the biscuits.

Oatmeal cookies were made during the third cooking exercise. On one day, eighth-grade aides prepared the batter while the seventh-grade students watched. The seventh-graders baked the cookies the next day.

Throughout all the cooking activities, Teacher AK had the tasks to be completed highly structured so the students had little opportunity to make errors or to become noisy or mischievous. This also was true of the orientation and food group recitations and assignments. The students had little control over their assignments, and the teacher limited student advancement within the assignment.

For cooking, Teacher AK divided the class into seven groups of four students each (see Table 4.14). She allowed the students to select the members of their groups, which was done during the second week of school. The groups did not change during the quarter. As noted above, Teacher AK selected the menu for each cooking assignment and assigned jobs (cutting, cooking, washing-up, and so forth) to students on a rotating basis. Thus, while there was division of labor within the group, the teacher assigned the students their roles. When the groups were cooking, Teacher AK did not limit student advancement.

Table 4.14

Teacher AK's Home Economics Activity Structure

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS					
CONTENT	GROUP SIZE	DIVISION OF LABOR	STUDENT CONTROL	EVALUATION	STUDENT ADVANCEMENT
Home Economics Nutrition Cooking	- Whole group for nutrition work - Small groups for cooking	- No division of labor for nutrition - Various students in each group assigned different tasks. Each group produced a single product	- No student control in nutrition - Cooking, students selected group members	- Behavior - public, negative - Academic - some public, both positive and negative, some private, written comments both positive and negative	- Dependent on teacher during nutrition - Students free to advance with cooking task without teacher approval

Teacher AK evaluated behavior publicly and negatively for purposes of behavior control. Academic evaluation varied, depending on the lesson structure. During recitation, student performance was evaluated publicly. Performance on the tests that were given once a week was evaluated privately by written grades or scores. The observer felt Teacher AK was very serious about the academic aspects of her class, reporting that some students received "D's" and "F's." During cooking, Teacher AK often had the students evaluate the groups' products, indicating which looked best, tasted best, etc.

One aspect of the home economics classes about which Teacher AK commented was the repetitiveness of the lessons. Because she taught the same content for four nine-week periods during the year, Teacher AK noted that she would work with students on the same nutrition

topics and same cooking assignments some 20 times during the year. She stated that she found it difficult to maintain enthusiasm for the course by the last nine-week period. Nonetheless, she continued to repeat lessons rather than to modify the curriculum.

Summary

The art and home economics classes offered students some variation in the types of tasks they were required to carry out compared with other classes. Hence these classes provided some diversity in the routine the students followed during a typical day, whereas the music class did not. Evaluation differed across the block classes. In terms of behavior control, Teachers AF and AK allowed students to move about and interact with one another, with the understanding that there would be no disruption of others' work. In contrast, in music class, Teacher AG allowed no interaction or mobility. All three teachers graded and made comments about students' completed assignments in private. Teacher AF's evaluative comments appeared to support and encourage students more than those made by the other two teachers.

Conclusion

With rare exceptions -- e.g., art, home economics, and one reading skills class -- the structures of the seventh-grade classes that were observed at Waverley Junior High School were remarkably similar. Rather than providing students with an array of differing structures and thus diverse academic and social demands, seventh grade appeared to be built around a series of highly similar, if not repetitious, experiences. As a result, students had few problems knowing what sorts of behavior were expected in the various classes.

Nonetheless, some students were more successful in some classes than in others (see Chapter Two in this volume and Volume IV). One feature of the classes that appeared to account for these differences was the way(s) in which teachers interacted with the students within the structures that were established. Some teachers gave lengthy and clear explanations of concepts and assignments, some did not. Some teachers clarified the basis on which performance would be evaluated (grades earned), some did not. A few teachers moved about the classroom helping students as they worked, but most did not. The majority of teachers enforced classroom rules, while a few overlooked students' misbehavior entirely. All told, when the above positive teacher behaviors occurred, students were more on task during classtime and thus completed their assignments for the most part. When one or more of these teacher behaviors were lacking, less on-task student behavior was observed and, as a consequence, many students failed to complete assignments.

CHAPTER FIVE

SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a brief description of the transition study teacher samples and the methodology utilized to collect the data reported herein. Volume I contains a more complete discussion of these aspects of the research effort.

Sample

The Junior High School Transition Study was conducted in a small city on the outskirts of a large metropolitan area. The city has undergone rapid growth during the last two decades. While a large portion of the city's work force now commutes into the central metropolitan area, the numerous feed mills that remain remind the visitor that agriculture still plays a significant role in the city's economy.

There are two school districts in the city, both serving a largely middle-class white population. They are a K-12 district and a K-6 district. Students from the latter district matriculate to the former upon graduation from sixth grade. The transition study took place in the sixth grades of both districts and in one of the two junior highs of the K-12 district. The study was divided into three phases. Phase I concentrated on sixth-grade classrooms. Phase II focused on students' entry to junior high school. Phase III included follow-up interviews with the seventh-grade students in the spring of their seventh-grade year (the first year in junior high school). Data reported herein involve only the Phase I and II samples. Each is described below.

Phase I

During Phase I of the study, which occured during May of the student sample's sixth-grade year, the following members of the school community were part of the study.

Schools. All schools feeding into Waverley Junior High School were invited to participate in this phase of the study. These schools were located in the two districts mentioned above; there were six in all. All six schools agreed to administer the Student Opinion Survey as part of the districts' ongoing evaluation programs. (This data set is reported in Volume III.) Two schools, however, declined to participate in the classroom observation aspect of the study, because each contained only one sixth-grade classroom, and anonymity of the teacher could not be maintained, given the type of data collection and reporting to be done.

Four schools, their sixth-grade teachers, and the students in these classes participated in Phase I. These four schools were CH Dana, Bluff Street, Hawthorne, and JM Keynes. Table 5.1 lists the feeder schools and the teachers who participated in Phase I.

Four teachers at CH Dana and three teachers at JM Keynes grouped their classes into "clusters" and shared instruction of the students. Hence the students in these schools, with the exception of those assigned to Teacher 301, moved from one teacher to another for instruction in the various subject areas. The teachers at Bluff Street, Hawthorne, and Teacher 301 at CH Dana taught self-contained classrooms.

Students. Students included in the sixth-grade phase of the study were those enrolled in the classes of the teachers noted above.

Phase II

Phase II of data collection began during August, before school opened in the fall, and continued until the middle of November. The sample for this aspect of the study is discussed below.

Waverley Junior High School. Waverley Junior High School is one of two junior high schools in the K-12 elementary district serving the semirural community described above. It is located at the intersection of a freeway and a main arterial city street. The school is composed of approximately 700 seventh- and eighth-graders.

Teachers. The Phase II teacher sample was drawn from those teachers at Waverley who worked with seventh-grade students. A total of 21 teachers taught these students at least one period per day. Eleven of the 21 teachers participated in the study. Of the 10 who did not take part, 4 taught seventh-graders during only one period of the day, one taught foreign language classes, and 3 taught physical education. No observations were conducted in physical education, because of the difficulty of following students and hearing teacher-student interactions on the playing field.

Table 5.2 lists the teachers who participated in Phase II. As can be noted from the table, these teachers taught the basic academic subjects of English, math, and world history, as well as the elective reading skills course and the arts and crafts "block." The block classes comprised a series of nine-week courses in art, music, home economics, and wood shop. Students rotated through the block during the year. One remedial class -- math fundamentals -- was observed. Across the teachers in the sample more than half the seventh-grade classes were included. Thus this sample provides a broad view of seventh-grade teachers' and students' experiences during the first two months of school.

The 11 participating teachers included 5 female and 6 male teachers. The female teachers taught reading, home economics, history, math, and English. The male teachers taught English, art, math, reading, and

Table 5.1

Sixth-Grade Teacher Sample and Data Collection in Which They Participated in Transition Study

	Cluster	Student Opinion Survey	Classroom Observations	Curriculum Interview	Student Participation Ratings
CH Dana School					
Teacher 301	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 302	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 303	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 304	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 305	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bluff Street School					
Teacher 401	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 402	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hawthorne School					
Teacher 601	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 602	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 603	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
JM Keynes School					
Teacher 701	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 702	yes	yes	yes	yes	no*
Teacher 703	yes	yes	yes	yes	no*

*Teacher 701 assigned Student Participation Ratings for all students in the cluster (Teachers 701, 702, and 703).

Table 5.2

Seventh-Grade Teachers, the Teaching Credential Each Holds, and the Subjects in Which Each was Observed

Teacher	Credential	Subjects in Which Observed
Teacher AA	Secondary	5 English classes
Teacher AB	Secondary	3 English classes 2 World History classes
Teacher AC	Secondary	1 English class
Teacher AD	Secondary	4 Math classes
Teacher AE	Elementary	3 Math classes
Teacher AF	Secondary	1 Art (Block) class
Teacher AG	Secondary	1 Music (Block) class 1 World History class
Teacher AH	Secondary	1 Reading Skills class
Teacher AI	Secondary	1 Reading Skills class
Teacher AJ	Secondary	4 World History classes 1 Math Fundamentals class
Teacher AK	Secondary	2 Home Economics Block classes

music. Their teaching experience ranged from 2 years to 39 years, with a majority having taught more than 6 years.

Since an individual can teach in a middle/junior high school in California with either an elementary or a secondary credential, it is interesting to note the credentials held by the sample teachers. Generally, the credential a teacher has reflects whether he or she completed a preservice preparation program focused on instruction in either elementary or secondary school. Because the approach to instruction often differs in these preparation programs, a teacher who completed an elementary preservice program and qualified for an elementary credential may be expected to teach differently than one who completed the secondary credential requirements. Only one of the sample teachers, Teacher AE, was trained as an elementary teacher and held an elementary credential. All others had secondary education training and credentials.

Students. While almost all students in Waverley's seventh grade participated in some aspects of the transition study, only target student data are reported in this volume. Thus only the target student sample is discussed here. Volume I includes additional information regarding the target student sample and data about the larger sample.

At the beginning of Phase II, 24 target students were selected, based on the following criteria:

-- Student came from a school participating in all aspects of the sixth-grade phase of the study,

-- Student was given a sixth-grade participation style rating by his or her sixth-grade teacher,

-- Student had parental permission to participate in Phase II of the study.

There were 55 students in this group.

From this group, the target students were selected so that:

-- Target students could be observed in classes taught by the seventh-grade teachers participating in the study. Every effort was made to include a math and English class for each target student. Additional classes were included as observer scheduling permitted.

-- An equal number of boys and girls participated.

-- Across the sample, students who had been rated by their sixth-grade teachers as exhibiting a variety of classroom participation styles would be represented (e.g., success students, social students, dependent students, phantom students, and alienated students). However, no "isolate" students had

permission to participate, so students evidencing these participation characteristics were not represented.

-- Students from each of the four sixth-grade schools were represented. Because of the restraints and complexities noted above, it was not possible to give each school equal representation. The number of students from each elementary school were:

CH Dana:	5
Bluff Street:	5
Hawthorne:	6
JM Keynes:	8

In this manner, 24 target students were selected.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection and analysis procedures applied during Phases I and II are outlined below.

Phase I

During the spring of the student sample's sixth-grade year, the transition study began. Two data sets from this phase were used in preparation of this volume: classroom observations and teacher interviews.

Classroom observations. As noted above, 13 of the 15 sixth-grade teachers whose classes were scheduled to attend Waverley agreed to be observed by Far West researchers. Table 5.1 lists the data that were collected in each of their classes. All 13 teachers were observed for one full school day.

When the data collectors entered these 13 classes, they were instructed to observe the following aspects of the classroom environment. First, the activity structures that the teacher had in place on the day of observation and the nature of the interaction between teacher and students within each structure were described. The observer completed an "activity structures coding sheet" detailing the activity structure elements present or not present during each period of the day. At the end of the day, the observers prepared an "informal observation" narrative, reporting on the teacher-student and student-student interactions that were observed, the discipline structure of the class, and other aspects of the classroom that the observer felt were significant.

Teacher interviews. In May, the 13 teachers also were interviewed by members of the transition study's professional staff. These interviews, labeled "curriculum interviews," elicited descriptions of

the teachers' instructional procedures and activity structures. The interviewer probed carefully to obtain a complete picture from each teacher. Each interview lasted from two to three hours.

Data analysis. The classroom observation activity structure coding sheets and curriculum interview data sets were reviewed and analyzed to obtain a rich portrait of the activity structures in the 13 sixth-grade classrooms. Based on these two data sets, a chart was prepared describing the activity structure elements for each subject taught in each sixth-grade classroom. These charts are presented in Chapter Three of this volume.

Using the charts, the informal observation narratives, and the curriculum interviews, a description of each class was prepared. These 13 descriptions included an elaboration of the activity structure elements that were used for each subject. The nature of the relationships between the teacher and the students and among the students themselves also were described. The participation demands students were required to meet in order to perform successfully in sixth grade were discussed. These data are presented in Chapter Three.

Phase II

Phase II data collection in the junior high school began as school opened in September. As noted above, the sample included teachers and students. (Parent interviews were also conducted, but are not reported in this volume.) The following data sets were collected and used in the preparation of this volume: formal classroom observations and informal observations, student interviews, and teacher narrative reports. Table 5.3 itemizes the data sets to which each seventh-grade teacher contributed. (It should be noted that, while the table lists the classroom participation observations on target students completed by the teachers, the data are not reported in this volume. Volume IV contains the discussion of these data.)

Classroom observations. Beginning on the first day of junior high school, observers were present in the classrooms of the participating teachers. During the observations, the observers took notes on classroom activities in order to prepare narrative descriptions of classroom events. They directed their attention to the target students' participation in the lesson, interaction with the teacher, academic interaction with peers, nonacademic interaction with peers, and behavior during seatwork. The observers were also instructed to make careful note of the activity structure in operation, teacher evaluations of academic and nonacademic behavior, and the teacher's management of the classroom. For the first five days of observation, the observers completed the same activity structure coding sheet used in Phase I of the study.

After the classroom observations were completed each day, the observers prepared and dictated their narrative descriptions for each class period that was observed. At regular intervals during this phase of the study, the observers also prepared informal observations,

Table 5.3

Seventh-Grade Teacher Sample Participation in Data Collection

Teacher	Classroom Observation	Self-Report Sept.	Self-Report Nov.	CPO** on Target Students
AA	yes	no	yes	yes
AB	yes	no	no	no
AC	yes	yes	yes	yes
AD	yes	no	yes	yes
AE	yes	no	yes	yes
AF	yes*	yes	yes	yes
AG	yes°	yes	yes	yes
AH	yes	yes	yes	yes
AI	yes+	no	no	no
AJ	yes	yes	yes	yes
AK	yes*	no	yes	yes

*Block class--no November observations

°No November observations in music, which was a block class; observations in history in November

+No November observations, as teacher withdrew from study

**Classroom participation observation

commenting on the teachers' and the students' behavior as it developed over time and presenting their evaluative judgments of what they had observed.

Most of the narrative descriptions focused on the target students. However, on occasion, and particularly on the first two days of school, the observers focused their attention on the teachers, recording the teachers' explanations of the rules and procedures to be observed in the classroom. In all, 637 narrative descriptions focusing on target students (an average of 26.5 per student) and 158 observations of teachers were completed. In addition 97 informal observations of students (4 per student) and an average of 5.2 informal observations per teacher were prepared by the observers.

Observations were conducted every day during the first week of school and on four of the five days of the second week of school. During the remainder of September and the first few days of October, observations occurred twice a week in each class. (The term "class" is used here to define one period of the school day; a teacher might have observations conducted in four or five periods, or classes, per day.)

In November, during the week report cards for the first quarter of the school year were distributed, classes were observed on four days (the fifth day was Veterans' Day, a holiday). As the block classes -- music, home economics, and art -- had finished in late October, at the end of the first quarter, students were not observed in their block classes in November.

Student interviews. Target students were interviewed twice during Phase II. The first interviews took place in October and lasted about 30 minutes. Two students were interviewed simultaneously. The second interviews took place in November during the last week of data collection, lasted about 40 minutes, and involved one student at a time. The interviews were conducted at the school, either in the library or in the administration wing.

Both interviews were open-ended and designed to elicit the same information, as we were interested in charting the development of the target students' views over time. The interviews began with inquiries about "how seventh grade is going" and proceeded to examine the differences, as the students perceived them, between sixth and seventh grade. The next main area of discussion concerned the students' experiences in their classes. We asked the students to tell us about their math and English classes, although if they spontaneously talked about other classes we observed, we encouraged the students to do so. During the discussion of their classes, we followed up on various statements made by the students to determine their understandings of grading policy, the rule system, and the availability of the teacher to help them with their work. These discussions, when combined with the narrative descriptions, provided a rich description of the students' classroom experiences.

The final section of the interviews dealt with the students' perceptions of authority and distributive justice and how these perceptions related to their junior high school experience.

Fourteen target student interviews were conducted in October and 21 in November. Two target students, Student A12 and A20, were not willing to be interviewed. Eight others had scheduling conflicts during one of the two interview periods and could not be interviewed both times.

Teacher narrative reports. Twice during the Phase II data collection period the researchers asked the participating teachers to prepare narrative reports. These reports were dictated into a tape recorder and then transcribed. Table 5.3 listed the teachers who completed one or both reports.

In late September, the participating teachers were asked to discuss their plans for the year in the class or classes in which they were being observed. The intention was to allow the teachers as much freedom as possible in describing their instructional goals. They were asked to discuss how they organized their instruction and what they hoped their students would achieve. Also, the teachers were asked to comment on the progress of their classes to date.

In November, the teachers were invited to an all-day meeting with the Far West researchers. This meeting focused on the generation of two data sets. First, the teachers were asked to comment on the progress of all the target students who were enrolled in any of their classes. These comments included, but were not restricted to, the students' academic progress, their interactions with the teacher and other students, and any anecdotal information about the students' behavior outside of class. Finally, the teachers were asked to assess the nature of the students' transitions.

Data analysis. Each of the Phase II data sets was analyzed separately. Information gained through these analyses then were combined to produce the teacher case descriptions presented in Chapter Four.

The narrative descriptions of teacher and student behavior in the classroom were read to determine the nature of the teachers' and students' participation on each day of observation. Notations were made on the narratives whenever the teacher disciplined a student. Points in the narratives describing the nature of the teacher's approach to the curriculum and his or her interactions with the students also were highlighted.

The students' academic behavior, including time on and off task, interaction with the teacher, attention to recitation, oral participation in the class, and grades -- along with other indicators of achievement -- were summarized. Information related to the students' interactions with peers was sought, including friendliness, academic or non-academic contact, and frequency.

Information regarding the activity structure(s) used by each teacher were compiled. In addition, the observers' informal observations of teachers and students were also employed in preparation of the teacher case descriptions. These observations included observers' evaluative comments on the teacher's and students' participation, actions, and conversations observed inside and outside the classroom, and judgments on consistencies and changes observed over time. Such data aided in interpretation of the narrative descriptions and activity structure tables reported in Chapter Four.

The student interviews provided a rich source of data on the students' perceptions of their junior high experiences. Besides discussing the teachers' rule systems, their academic participation requirements, and the systems of authority and distributive justice in their classes -- particularly math and English -- students readily and spontaneously volunteered information about the types and effectiveness of punishments, the teachers' personalities, and their own successes and failures, problems, and joys in their classes.

This information was carefully examined, compared with other data sets, and used to enrich our understanding of the students' seventh-grade experience during the first two and a half months of school. The impact of the teachers' behaviors on this experience also was considered.

Teacher narratives were used for two main purposes in the construction of the case descriptions reported here. First, the teachers' comments about the structure of their classrooms and their plans for the year enriched our understanding of their activity structures. Second, their comments on the target students provided another perspective of the students' and the teachers' participation and interactions in the classroom. These comments were compiled and used along with the other data sets to prepare the teacher case descriptions.

Summary

The sample and data sets employed in preparing the findings reported in this volume included sixth- and seventh-grade teachers and seventh-grade students. Descriptive narrative observations, activity structure coding, and teacher and student interviews served as the primary data sources.

REFERENCES

Barr, R., & Dreeben, R. Instruction in classrooms. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (Vol. 5). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, Inc., 1977.

Becker, H., Greer, B., & Hughes, E. Making the grade. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Bidwell, C. E. Schooling and socialization for moral commitment. Interchange, 1972, 3(4), 1-27.

Blyth, D. A., Simmons, R. G., & Bush, D. The transition into early adolescence: A longitudinal comparison of youth in two educational contexts. Sociology of Education, 1978, 51, 149-162.

Bossert, S. T. Activity structures and student outcomes. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego, January 1978.

Bossert, S. T. Tasks and social relationships in classrooms: A study of classroom organization and its consequences. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Dahloff, U. Ability grouping: Content validity and curriculum process analysis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Doyle, W. Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis of induction into teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

Doyle, W. The tasks of teaching and learning in classrooms. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Doyle, W. Accomplishing writing tasks in the classroom. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, 1981.

Dreeben, R. The contribution of schooling to the learning of norms. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37(2), 211-237.

Dreeben, R. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Elder, G. H., Jr. Adolescent socialization and personality development. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1968.

Evertson, C. M. Differences in instructional activities in high and low achieving junior high classes (Report No. 6106). Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Good, T. L. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(2), 52-64.

Gump, P. V. The school as a social situation. In L. W. Porter & M. R. Rosenzweig (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology (Vol. 31). Palo Alto: Annual Review Press, 1980.

Jackson, P. W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. Instructional goal structure: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44(2), 213-240.

Lipsitz, J. S. The age group. In M. Johnson (Ed.), The National Society for the Study of Education 1980 Yearbook. Chicago: NSSE, 1980.

McPartland, J., Epstein, J. L., & McDill, E. L. Student reactions to the transition from open elementary school to junior high school: A case study (Report No. 139). Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1972.

Metz, M. H. Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1978.

Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Rosenshine, B. Content, time and direct instruction. In P. Peterson, & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1980.

Sayles, L. Behavior of industrial work groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Schlechty, P. C. Teaching and social behavior: Toward an organizational theory of instruction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Slavin, R. E. Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50(2), 315-342.

Tanner, J. M. Growth at adolescence (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science, 1961.

Spady, W. G. The authority system of the school and student unrest: A theoretical exploration. In W. G. Gordon (Ed.), The National Society for the Study of Education 1974 Yearbook. Chicago: NSSE, 1974.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Mergendoller, J. R. Technical proposal: Ecological perspectives for successful schooling practice, program #2. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Weinstein, R. S. Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Westbury, I. Activity structures and pupil outcomes. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego, 1978.